Saml. Miller.

MR. BARNES'

REPLY

TO THE REMARKS OF THE

EPISCOPAL RECORDER.

BX
5950
.B3763
1844

From the Library of
Professor Samuel Miller
in Memory of
Judge Samuel Miller Breckinridge
Presented by
Samuel Miller Breckinridge Long
to the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary
BBX 5950 .B3763 1844
BBarnes, Albert, 1798-1870.
AReply to a review of the
tract on the position of

REPLY

TO A REVIEW OF THE TRACT

ON

THE POSITION OF THE

EVANGELICAL PARTY

IN THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

CONTAINED

IN THE EPISCOPAL RECORDER OF MARCH 16, 23, AND 30, 1844.

BY ALBERT BARNES.

PHILADELPHIA:

PERKINS & PURVES.

1844.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Since this Reply was commenced, the articles in the Episcopal Recorder to which it refers, have been collected and published in a small pamphlet. To the original articles, an appendix is added, designed to contrast some opinions which I expressed two years ago on the subject of Episcopacy, in two articles in the Christian Spectator, with those expressed in the Tract on the "Position of the Evangelical Party." I could show, I think, if it were important, that there is no real contradiction between the views expressed in those two articles; but I am free to confess that my views have changed—as I suppose those of most persons have—about Episcopacy since the time when those articles were published. I used expressions then, which a more intimate acquaintance with the subject led me, on republishing the articles from the Spectator a year since, considerably to change; and which I fear there is still further occasion to modify. It is a subject of sincere regret to me, that facts on which no observer of passing events could close his eyes, have made it necessary to change those views at all. But who, ten years ago, could have anticipated the developements which have been made in the Episcopal church since that time—developements which have alarmed a large portion in that denomination itself, as well as the whole Protestant community around it? That my views, under these circumstances, have been somewhat modified, I

cannot deny, and am willing to acknowledge. He must be a remarkable man whose opinions undergo no change as he grows older, and a man singularly confident in his earlier wisdom, who is unwilling to confess it. But in one thing I have not changed—in the language of respect and kindness with which I design to speak of that church, and in my belief that it is a part of the true church of the Redeemer, and that there are many within it who are laboring as sincerely and as zealously as any others in endeavouring to promote his cause. When will Episcopalians so far modify *their* views as to believe there is any true church besides their own?

There are several things of a personal character in the review in the Recorder, which I have not thought it proper to notice in this reply. My neglecting to do so is not to be construed as an admission of their correctness, but of my conviction that in a grave discussion, pertaining to an important subject, they should not have been admitted at all. The public have no interest in them, and they contribute nothing to settle an inquiry after truth, or to determine what is the true character and tendency of Episcopacy. Of this nature is the following assertion of the Editors: "Mr. Barnes feels compelled to preach to his own congregation, in reference to its errors, (those of Episcopacy,) *for the present book was first produced in this particular shape.*" What is the foundation of this assertion, I know not, but the editors are certainly misinformed. Of the seventy pages of my Tract, nine were copied indeed from a sermon; but in the sermon there was no mention of Episcopacy whatever, and no particular reference to it. I have never felt "compelled" in any way to preach about

Episcopacy, and have never mentioned it in my preaching, but in the same respectful manner in which I speak of Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians.

Perhaps the following assertion deserves a more serious notice. "Has he (Mr. Barnes) forgotten his own free expressions to a late friend of ours, made about that time, (the time of the difficulties in the Presbyterian church,) to the effect that a much harder pressure would have led him to seek a ministry in the Episcopal church?" There must be some mistake in this. My memory furnishes me with no recollection of any such conversation; and I am certain that I never intended what is here said. That I have said that a harder pressure might have induced me to leave the *Presbyterian* church, is quite probable. But I never had any intention of connecting myself with the Episcopal church. Almost twenty-five years since, notwithstanding some urgent efforts made at that time to induce me to join the Episcopal church, I entered the Presbyterian church—a church, which, during that long time, observation and study have taught me more and more to love, and to regard in its doctrines, and in its mode of government, as nearer to the principles of the New Testament than any other.

ALBERT BARNES.

Philadelphia, May 4, 1844.

REPLY, &c.

The Episcopal Recorder contains a Review of the Tract on "the Position of the Evangelical party in the Episcopal church," extended through three numbers of the paper, and under the responsibility of the editorial department. This Review is of such a character, as to demand from the author of the Tract a reply. With me this reply shall be final on the subject. The public shall have no occasion to dread a protracted controversy between me and the editors of the Recorder, and, unless something shall appear from some other quarter which will give an opportunity of further discussing the essential character and tendency of Episcopacy, the whole matter, so far as I am concerned, will be submitted to the calm judgment of the public. I have had an opportunity of expressing my views at length, and have availed myself of a right, which I had in common with all others, to examine the subject of Episcopacy as it is before the public in the best form in which it has ever appeared—in the efforts made by the Evangelical party. I have stated, neither with unkindness, nor severity of language, what seemed to me to be insuperable difficulties in their 'position.' I have examined the Prayer Book—a book which Episcopalians are constantly commending to the attention of the community, as if they were not

unwilling that it should be examined with the utmost freedom; and I have compared the aims, and plans, and efforts of the Evangelical party with what I found in that Book. These views, the result of all the attention which I have been able to give to the subject, I have submitted to the consideration of others, as what seemed to me, to have an important bearing on religion.

The editors of the Recorder as the organs of the Evangelical party, have done, what they had an undoubted right to do, by expressing at length their views of the Tract. They have had leisure to examine its positions. They may be supposed, without impropriety, to give utterance to the sentiments of that party in the Episcopal church. They are familiar with the Prayer Book, and are abundantly qualified to do justice to the views, and to vindicate the aims of the party with which they are identified. They have ability to correct any misapprehensions which may have existed in the mind of the author of the Tract, and of those who think with him, and the subject has been before them from week to week in such a manner that it may be presumed that the views which they have now expressed are *all* which they deem it of importance to submit to the public in reply to the Tract. There is a propriety therefore, that with this notice of their Review, my participation in the discussion should cease, nor can it be presumed that any thing which they will be disposed to say to this reply, if they think it of importance to notice it at all, will make it proper that the attention of the public should be any farther solicited by me.

A few things seem necessary to be said on my part to meet what they have advanced, and to place

the whole argument in my Tract where I would wish to leave it, after having been carefully examined by keen-sighted reviewers. Having done this, the whole argument, so far as I am concerned, will be submitted to the christian public, to be or not to be, as that public shall judge, among the means of forming an opinion of the essential tendency of Episcopacy.

The Tract was prepared, as was stated in the commencement of it (p. 5), "from no desire to intermeddle with the internal affairs of another denomination of christians." The Episcopal church is prominently before the community. It has now, and indeed always has had in this country, from causes which could easily be stated, a prominence before the public, which has not been by any means commensurate with its numbers, its real strength, or its relative importance. I do not speak of it in derogation of any excellence which it is entitled to, by saying that its claims have been put forward with a boldness and zeal which have been evinced by no other denominations. Its friends might claim this as one of its excellencies; I am not now called on to determine whether it is an excellency or an error of the system. Of the *fact* no one will be disposed to doubt, that the claims of Episcopacy have been presented with a degree of confidence which has never been evinced by the much more numerous denominations of Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians.

General reasons for examining Episcopacy at the present time.

There are important reasons for examining these claims, and it is difficult to see how blame can be

attached to what has hitherto been conceded to be proper, and, indeed, what has been, in some degree at least, *courted* by Episcopalians themselves. Among the reasons which seemed to me to make it particularly proper to examine their claims at the present time, were such as the following:—

(1.) The general attitude which the Episcopal church has been understood to assume in reference to other denominations of Christians. With a considerable portion of the Episcopal church, embracing all who are generally known as 'high churchmen,' it has been understood that they do not recognize any other churches than those which are Prelatical; and that they do not regard any as in any proper sense ministers of the gospel, except those who have been Episcopally ordained. On their part, there has been the utmost frankness in their statements. They have not, in general, been understood as denying that others may *possibly* be saved; but they have spoken of them as being in substantially the same condition, in regard to salvation, as those who have never heard of the name of the Saviour. As mere specimens of this claim, and of the manner in which Episcopalians have allowed themselves to speak on this subject, I will refer to the language of two distinguished ministers of that church. The first is Bishop Hobart. "Where the gospel is proclaimed, communion with the church, by participation of its ordinances, *at the hands of a duly authorized priesthood, is the indispensable condition of salvation.*"—Companion for the Altar, p. 302. Bishop Ravenscroft says, that the "church, the ministry, and the sacraments, are as distinctly and truly the appointments of God, for the salvation of sinners, as the faith of the gospel, and that

it is only as these are united in the profession of religion, can the hope, thereby given to a man, be worthy of the name of assurance."—Doctrines of the Church vindicated, pp. 31, 32. It has not been uncommon for this portion of the Episcopal church to speak of others as "left to the uncovenanted mercies of God;" to deny that they have a valid ministry and valid sacraments, and to refuse to recognize others as in any proper sense churches of the Lord Jesus. Hence, they uniformly re-ordain, if one goes over to them from another Protestant denomination, and though they do not always re-baptise, it is not because they regard others as authorized ministers of the gospel, but because they admit the validity of *lay* baptism. In all the high church movements in this country, there never has been an act performed by them, it is believed, or an expression of an opinion from any one of their distinguished writers, by which there has been a recognition of any other church, or by which others are regarded as in any sense whatever, true churches of the Lord Jesus. No one can fail to admire the consistency and steadfastness with which these views have been held, whatever may be thought of the church within whose bosom they are found. Whether these views are to be regarded or not as of the nature of an "*attack*" on other denominations, or whether they are mere *defence*, and have nothing aggressive, is a question on which it is probable different persons would have quite different opinions. It may not be of the nature of an *attack* on a man to say that he has no claims to the rights of a citizen; that his title-deeds to his property are worthless; that his marriage is void, and that his children are illegitimate. If such asser-

tions, however, are made, most plain persons would consider that if they examined these charges, they were not making an *attack*, but stood merely upon a *defence*. Now whatever *feelings* other denominations might have in regard to this claim, whether of sorrow, indignation, or contempt, there was no ground of complaint in regard to the frankness and clearness with which the opinion was avowed. That matter was settled, and high church Episcopalians and other denominations of Christians perfectly understood each other on the point. Episcopacy is now making a new struggle. Under the better auspices of the low church party, it appears in a new phase. It is putting forth new efforts, and in a new direction. It seems to be attempting to adapt itself to the large and liberal spirit of the age, and to be disposed to fall in with the evangelical efforts which have been originated in, and which characterise other denominations. It was not an unnatural desire to know what modification Episcopacy is susceptible of undergoing while still retaining its essential features; and it was not unnatural or improper to ask, whether it *could* be so moulded as to recognize other ministers, and to fall into the great family of churches, as on a level with others; and it was not unnatural or improper to ask of the leading advocates of the new efforts, what *are* their views and aims in reference to this matter.

(2.) A second reason for examining the subject, is, that the recent developements in the Episcopal church, have *forced* the enquiry on the community. It is impossible for even "a looker on in Venice" to close his eyes on the facts in regard to those developements. The things which are coming to pass in the Episcopal church in these days

"are not done in a corner;" and they are such that other denominations besides the one more immediately interested, cannot but feel an interest in the result. The subject pertains to our common Christianity. Not only have the growing dissensions and strifes of that denomination been such as to show that, with all the boasted proclamations of "unity," there *is* no essential harmony, no *oneness* whatever in the Episcopal sect; that there exists there all the elements, if not the form, of schism; that there is in fact a more vital and essential variance than there is between any two Protestant denominations; that the tree is split at the centre, though the bark has not yet opened, or the sundered parts gone off from each other; but there have been developements in one of the parties—and that by far the largest in this country—which have alarmed the Christian world. It is impossible but that other Christians should know this. It cannot be wrong to know it. It is not the spirit of intermeddling to feel an interest in it. And it cannot be improper for any one, either within or without the Episcopal church, to inquire whether these developements are in accordance with the essential tendency of the system, and to express his convictions to the world. One of the fair ways of judging of a system always is, by its developements. "The tree is known by its fruits."

(3.) A third reason for this examination is, that the character, aims, and zeal of the party which is opposed to the Oxford developements, are such as in themselves tend strongly to secure the sympathy of all evangelical christians. That party is known not to be numerous, and it has been supposed that they constitute but a feeble minority in

the Episcopal church. Yet their general aims are distinct and definite. They accord with the evangelical denominations of christians in their main efforts. They are the friends of spiritual religion; of the doctrines of the new birth, and of justification by faith; of Revivals, Sabbath schools, and of Prayer meetings; and they have manifested to some extent, a warm sympathy with those who are endeavouring to distribute the word of life around the world. With these aims others warmly sympathize. Yet as a great question pertaining to our common christianity, it *could* not but occur to inquire, whether these aims are in accordance with what has been for ages understood to be Episcopacy, and with Episcopacy as it is found in their own standards. It is a question in which others have a deep interest, and which from any thing that has yet appeared, others have a right to examine, whether these aims are practicable; whether others should be encouraged, as they have been in times past, to throw in their influence with that party, and whether the Episcopal church is destined to take its place with the Evangelical denominations of the christian world, wholly imbued, as the low churchman wishes, with the spirit of evangelism. From any thing that appears, other christians have a right to ask whether the whole frame-work of Episcopacy, and its whole spirit, be not against them. At all events, whether these enquiries are propounded to the public or not, they are passing through the minds of thousands who love Zion, and who are ready to hail any *feasible* effort for the advancement of Evangelical religion.

(4.) There is another reason for the examination of Episcopacy in every phase in which it may ap-

pear. It is because the influence of Episcopacy in the church has been at no time either negative or unimportant. Taking the christian church at large, it has done more to make it what it is at this day, than any other cause whatever. Episcopalians believe that the influence has been good; others doubt it, and at all events the results are before the world. It is the boast of Episcopalians, and is one of their favourite arguments for the divine origin of Prelacy, that the forms of their religion spread over about nineteen twentieths of the christian world, and that for centuries almost the whole church reposed under its umbrageous shadow. It prevailed in the time of Constantine—whatever may be said of the ages before him. The whole Papal world has been Episcopal 'without shadow of turning' throughout its entire history. The Greek church has always been Prelatical in its form. The Armenian, the Nestorian, and the Coptic churches are wholly Episcopal in their structure. Episcopacy has showed its features in every clime, and among every people. It has been seen in the place where our Lord was crucified; on the mount where he was transfigured, and the mount from whence he ascended to heaven; in the neighbourhood of Lebanon and Olympus; in classic Greece, and in the eastern and western capitals of the Roman world; in Egypt, and all northern Africa; in Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, Germany and England; amidst the snows of Scandinavia, and in the burning regions of the tropics: it has been seen in Ireland, South America, Mexico, Lower Canada and Cuba; and having developed its nature in all these places and countries, it is now developing itself amidst the free insti-

tutions of America. It is right to enquire what was its influence on Europe and Asia, during the dark ages; it is right to enquire what has been and is its influence in Syria, Greece, Egypt, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Russia, France, Ireland, Brazil, Mexico, Cuba and Lower Canada; and it is right to ask, judging from the past and the present, what *will* be its influence in the United States. Of nothing in this world has there been a fairer experiment made than of the influence of Episcopacy, and nothing *can* be a fairer subject of investigation. It appears here, indubitably in its best form. It seeks to catch the spirit of this age. It would even ally itself with the once rejected spirit of Puritanism. It becomes the warm friend of Evangelical religion, of Revivals, and Missions, and of efforts to train the young in sabbath schools. It is *right* to enquire what is the prospect of success in the new phase in which it appears. It is right to ask of history what it has been; to look into the Prayer Book and to see what it is there; to contemplate the lucubrations of the Oxford divines, and to ask whether they are wholly mistaken in their understanding of what Episcopacy is; and to ask whether the Evangelical party are or are not engaged in an impracticable undertaking, when they seek to blend Evangelical religion with the Religion of Forms. It is *time* to examine the essential nature of the system, and it is *proper* to do it, even though the examination should lead us to doubt the infallibility of the Prayer Book, and the wisdom of the Parliament of 1548, which enacted that it had been composed BY THE AID OF THE HOLY GHOST.*

* Wheatly on Common Prayer. p. 28.

PARTICULAR REASONS FOR INQUIRING INTO THE POSITION OF THE EVANGELICAL PARTY.

These are some of the reasons for an examination of the general claims and purposes of Episcopacy at the present time. Some of the more particular reasons for inquiring into the "position of the *Evangelical Party*" in that church, at the present time, are these:—

(1.) The claims of the high church party, so far as other denominations are concerned, have not been disavowed by them. There has been no general and open remonstrance against those claims, and no general attempt to show that they were contrary to the genius of the Episcopal church. There has been no recognition of other ministers and churches among the low church Episcopalians, any more than there has been by their high church brethren; and though they have been willing to co-operate with them, on many subjects, yet it never has been with them *as* with ministers and churches. In other denominations of Christians, there is a mutual recognition. No one ever doubts what are the views of Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Dutch Reformed, German Reformed, Lutherans, and Moravians, in regard to each other. There is no concealment. There is no withholding of mutual recognition. The pulpits of the one denomination are never closed against the other; and the community understand that they regard others as on the same level with themselves. But neither from high or low church Episcopalians is there any such general recognition, and if occasionally an individual of the low church party has expressed a belief of the validity of the ordination of other ministers, it has been understood to be an exception to the general faith of his party;

and even he has felt himself restrained by his "canons," from any act of public recognition.

(2.) The low church party are in the habit of re-baptising the members received from other churches. I do not say that this is always done; but if I am correctly informed, it is more frequently done than it is by their high church brethren.* It is not indeed *always* done; but where it is not done, the alleged reason why it is not, is of a nature more fitted to give offence to other denominations of christians, than if it were done. It is not omitted because they consider that other ministers have had a valid ordination, and have a right to administer the sacraments, but because they admit the validity of *lay baptism*, and recognize such a baptism just as they would that administered by one who made no pretensions to the ministerial character. This is the ground distinctly taken in the late letters of Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, who is understood to act with the low church party. On this subject he uses the following language: "The first subject which I shall present is that of Lay Baptism, inasmuch as the novel practice of re-baptizing those who have received baptism at the hands of our non-episcopal brethren, is *openly defended*, and *is on the increase*." p. 6. Against the practice of re-baptizing, the Bishop then strenuously argues through more than fifty pages; and the ground of his opposition to the practice is not, that non-episcopal ministers have a valid ordination, or have a right to administer the sacraments, but that their baptism is to be recognized *because* lay baptism is

* This statement is made on the authority of an Episcopal clergyman.

valid. Perhaps a more signal and public attempt to show the invalidity of the ordination of their ministers, or one which is more adapted to give offence to non-episcopalians, has never occurred than this. Nothing could be so much fitted to give pain as an extended argument of this kind, in which there is no intimation that they are ordained, or that they are ministers of the gospel in any sense; but that what they do in baptism should be recognized by Episcopalians, *because* baptism by any *man*, or even *woman*, (p. 48,) is to be recognized by them; *because* this can be shown to have been the practice of the "Fathers," the Papists, and by the founders of the Episcopal church; *because* in the time of Athanasius, the "baptism of *boys in play*" was recognized (pp. 27, 28,); because Augustine held that those "who were separated from the unity of the church" might baptise, (p. 35); *because* Pope Leo taught that "the baptism of heretics must not be repeated (p. 39); and *because* the venerable Bede taught that "Whether a heretic, or a schismatic, or *any wicked wretch whatever*, baptises in the confession of the Holy Trinity, it avails not that he who is thus baptised should be re-baptised by good catholics; and that after it is once done, it can by no means be repeated." (p. 47.) Such is the reasoning on which this low church Prelate in the nineteenth century, and in Protestant America, endeavors to convince Episcopalians of both parties, that they ought to recognize the baptism administered by Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, and the Dutch and German churches.

How far *such* language and *such* a recognition will contribute to remove the feelings with which the claims of the high church party are regarded

by others, may admit of some diversity of opinion. For one, the frank declaration of high churchmen, that I am in no sense to be regarded as a minister of the gospel, is far more grateful to my feelings than the admission that baptism administered by me is valid, *because I am a layman.*

(3.) The same thing exists in regard to re-ordination. The low church party declare that "within the last thirty years, about three hundred *ministers* of other denominations have entered the ministry of the Episcopal church." See the Episcopal Recorder of January 27, 1844. The statistics are not furnished on which this statement is made, and it is impossible for me to ascertain from what denominations these accessions have been derived. It may be presumed that a small portion of them have come from the Roman Catholic church; a few have gone from Presbyterians; the great mass, it is supposed, are Methodists. None of the *Catholics* have been re-ordained; *all the rest* undoubtedly have been. No one, according to the Prayer Book, (Preface to the Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,) can be admitted to the clerical office in the Episcopal church in this country, "who hath not had Episcopal consecration or ordination." On the supposition, then, that fifty of the converts have been from the Romanist communion, there have been exhibited to this community, within the time specified, two hundred and fifty distinct cases in which there has been a public refusal to recognize the ministry of other denominations. Some of those who have been thus re-ordained, are now in the ranks of the low church party; having submitted to the indignity of abjuring their ordination, and

making by the act a public declaration that all those from whom they separated, have no valid title to the ministry. Some of those who have thus re-ordained others, are Prelates who are identified with the low church party, bringing now in each and every case, the weight of their private character and official standing to proclaim through the whole extent of their dioceses, and throughout the land, their belief that all other ordination but Episcopal is invalid. Meantime, from no organ of the low church, from no pulpit, and from no press, have we heard the slightest note of rebuke or dissent from these public acts. So far as appears, without a solitary exception, they have acquiesced in acts which proclaim that the Papacy is a true church, and that all their Protestant brethren, except the Moravians, are without a valid ministry. It may be assumed, therefore, that there is not a low church Prelate, Priest, or Deacon, in this land, who would recognize a Presbyterian, a Baptist, or a Methodist ordination; and that there is not a low church minister who would feel himself called upon to utter a note of remonstrance at the public indignity thus shown to the ministers of every other religious denomination. Whether it is wrong to ask our Episcopal brethren of the low church on what principles it is that they regard an ordination in the Papal communion as entitling to higher public respect, and as better qualifying for the true work of the ministry, than ordination in the Protestant churches, may be safely left to the community to determine.

(4.) So far as the low church have expressed themselves on the points at issue between the high church and other Protestants, they have identified themselves with the former. Thus Bishop McCos-

kry, of Michigan, says, "It is only through this ministry (that is, an Episcopally ordained ministry) that pardon and acceptance with God can be made known." "The apostles held the only ministry which was held of Christ. Not only the power to rule and govern the church, but also it must follow, to continue the same power. If not, there has never been any authorized ministry in the church, and all who profess to be commissioned as ambassadors of Christ, are gross impostors." Sermon, Feb. 19, 1842.

Bishop Hopkins, also, while he reasons, in no very conclusive manner, that the name 'church' has been given, and should be given, by Episcopalians to other denominations, yet maintains that they have "*lost the apostolic order of the ministry;*" that is, if words have a natural signification, they are without any regular and authorized ministry. "Those portions of christendom," says he, "which retain the fundamental verities of the christian faith, are entitled, for the faith's sake, to be called churches, ALTHOUGH THEY HAVE LOST THE APOSTOLIC ORDER OF THE MINISTRY." "I beg leave," says he, "to be understood as distinctly maintaining that the institution of the *Episcopal church government is* DIVINE, because apostolic." "The *completeness* or *perfection* of the church, requires both the apostolic *doctrine* and *government*. The *faith* of the church, and the *ministry* of the church should doubtless go together. The first is the jewel; the second is the casket. But the loss of the one does not necessarily involve the loss of the other; even as the destruction of the body does not necessarily involve the destruction of the soul." The Novelties which disturb our peace, Letter 2 pp. 8—9. So also on

pp. 51, 52, Bishop Hopkins holds the following language. "*Every consistent churchman is* OBLIGED *to deny that the ministry of non-episcopal churches is a regular apostolic ministry.* For we all, with a very few exceptions, maintain the apostolic and divine institution of Episcopacy; we all maintain that the work of ordination belongs of right, to none but Bishops, who as ordainers, and governors in chief over the church, were appointed to succeed the apostles. *It results, of course, that we cannot regard the non-episcopal ministry as men regularly ordained, but rather as* LAYMEN, *exercising ministerial functions according to a rule of human, instead of divine; of modern, instead of apostolic institution. Hence their baptisms are lay baptisms.* They are also liable to the charge of schism, and some are not free from the more grievous infection of heresy."

Scarcely any work of these times has been more heartily commended by the Episcopal Recorder than this of Bishop Hopkins. How far it is satisfactory to others to have their baptism regarded as valid because that of laymen is valid, and to be told that "they have lost the apostolic ministry," and that they have "the jewel, but that the casket is gone," and that they are to be recognized as *churches* in the same sense that a soul without a body is to be regarded as *a man*, it is not difficult to imagine. How, with these views, other denominations *can* be recognized as *churches*, is a problem of somewhat difficult solution. At all events, since other churches are thus disowned by the low church party as well as the high; since the views thus expressed are endorsed or sanctioned by every public and official act; and since when there is any ap-

pearance of recognition it is done in a manner so little satisfactory to others, and in a way so inevitably leading to the impression that an *essential* thing is wanting in all non-episcopal churches, it cannot be deemed improper to examine the nature of these claims.

(5.) One other thing has been apparent also among low churchmen. They have evinced great and commendable zeal against the views of the Oxford writers, and the aims of the high church party. But on the signal injustice publicly done to a large portion of the Protestant world, in denying that they have a valid ministry and valid ordinances, we have heard from them no note of remonstrance. At these extraordinary claims, they express no grief. When a Papist is admitted to their ministry without being re-ordained, and a Presbyterian or Methodist neophyte is on the same day ordained as a *deacon*, after having exercised the office of the ministry for years, there is no expression of disapprobation. Is it of the nature of an "attack;" is it "persecution" in these circumstances to examine the subject of Episcopacy as it is actually before the public, even in its best form? Are other denominations to be regarded as aggressors when they kindly but firmly lift up the voice of remonstrance against the position which their professedly Protestant brethren choose to take against them? It may be a mere logomachy to endeavour to ascertain from what quarter the "attack" really comes, and it may be safely left to the public to determine. Whether to hold up all other ministers of the gospel as "impostors;" to re-baptise those who are proselytes from other denominations, or to maintain that they are *not* to be re-baptised because the baptism of "laymen,"

and "women," and "boys," and "heretics," or any "wicked wretch whatever" is valid; to re-ordain all ministers from other denominations *except* Papists; to affirm that the ministers of other denominations are all laymen, exercising their functions "according to a human instead of a divine institution," be or be not of the nature of an "attack," may not be a matter worth contending about. The *thing itself* has an importance which demands investigation, whoever is the agressor.

It is for such reasons that I do not deem it improper, to submit to the public my views of the aims and efforts of the Evangelical party in the Episcopal church. It has been said that I have made an unprovoked attack on another denomination. This was to be expected, and though the examination was conducted in the mildest and kindest manner possible, it was probably not practicable to avoid this charge. The charge seems to have been made because our Episcopal brethren do not appreciate the feelings of the religious community around them, and because there is a difference of view between us as to what constitutes attack and defence.

But in reply to this charge of making an "attack," and to all that is said of "persecution" by Episcopalians, at present, I would make two other remarks. One is, that it is of the nature of Protestantism to consider it right to examine with the utmost freedom, *every thing* which comes before the community affecting our common christianity. The church is one. The interests of truth pertain to all, and any thing in the bosom of the christian church, any where, which affects the common cause; any developements of christianity; or any doctrines put forth, we regard as a fair subject of

investigation. Presbyterians do not think that they have a right to complain if their church polity and order, or if their doctrinal articles of religion are examined freely; nor do Baptists construe it as an "attack" or as "persecution" if we attempt to show the propriety of household baptism, or that their views of "close communion" are not in accordance with the New Testament; nor are Methodists accustomed to complain if there is a free enquiry into the polity of their own church. In the Presbyterian church, it has never been considered impertinent, intrusive, or improper in any sense, for other denominations to examine their general 'position,' or the 'position' of any party in that church, with the utmost freedom. During the late contentions in that church, the aims, and purposes, and theology of what has been called "the new school party," were examined at great length in a series of articles first published in the Christian Advocate and Journal, the leading paper of the Methodist denomination; and subsequently collected and published in a volume entitled "An examination of the System of New Divinity, or New School Theology," in 1839. No Presbyterian of either party, as far as I know, either then or since, has made complaint of this as an "attack," as "intermeddling," or as "persecution." We published our views to the wide world. We invited the world to examine them as freely and as long as they pleased. Believing that they were true, we were *desirous* that they should be looked at. If offence were to be taken because such an examination was made, it would be very easy to show that that book contained much more that was adapted to give offence, than anything in my little pamphlet on Epis-

copacy. It is quite difficult to see what there is in the Episcopal church which renders a similar examination improper, or why that which has been regarded as proper elsewhere, should be construed as an "attack," or as "persecution" there. It is difficult to see that there is *any* church that can claim an exception from this right to a free examination of its views—and least of all one which claims to be the *only true* church now existing on the earth. It is very certain that Episcopalians have not usually been particularly restrained from expressing their views, by any very delicate scruples about the right of enquiring into the polity of other churches, and their claims to an equality with themselves.

But there was another reason which led to the statement of the thoughts suggested in the Tract on "the position of the evangelical party in the Episcopal church." I wrote the article, indeed, at the suggestion of no one, and published it without submitting it to any others; but the thoughts there expressed are by no means confined to the individual who wrote the Tract. They are inquiries in which the religious community at large is interested. Other churches are by no means uninterested spectators of the "position" which the Evangelical party now occupies, or of their aims and purposes. While all their sympathies, as the friends of religion, are with the Evangelical party, they think they see that those objects can never be secured in connection with the Episcopal church, but that the whole history of Prelacy has been at variance with these efforts. They suppose that if those objects are to be secured, it must be by a freer organization, and that the Prayer Book, in its present form at

least, is an insuperable barrier to the accomplishment of their purposes. We do not wish to interfere with their internal organization; to attempt to decide the questions which have sprung up among themselves; to throw any influence in favour of one party or the other; to give increased rancour to the strife which has already so effectually destroyed all appearance of the once boasted "unity" in the Episcopal church, and which make it doubtful whether an allusion to that "unity" now is designed to be serious or ironical; or to exasperate one of the parties against the other. We do not suppose that we have a right to intermeddle with an internal and domestic warfare, but we *have* a right to inquire what Episcopacy *has been* in its whole history from the days of Constantine; what has been its influence in the ages in which it has engrossed all of Christianity to itself, and what it *is in its best form*—the form in which it is held by the Evangelical party in that church. We are not enemies who wish to thwart their plans; we are not foreigners who have come in to disturb the peace of a neighbour; we are brethren who have a right to discuss the general aims and plans of our Christian brethren, so far as they choose to put them forth before the world; and it will not be practicable for the Episcopal church to make any "capital" out of the assertion that they are a "persecuted" people. The community is often credulous, but this is probably the last thing which it will be disposed to believe.

THE MANNER IN WHICH IT WAS TO BE PRESUMED THE INQUIRY WOULD BE MET.

It was natural to have anticipated that if the examination of Episcopacy were conducted in a kind

manner, it would be met with a kind spirit. If in any denomination of christians there are what appears to others to be difficulties of a serious character, it was natural to suppose that they would be candidly explained; if objections are made to doctrines or practices in any Christian church, there is an obvious propriety that there should be the spirit of kindness in the manner in which those objections are removed. Nothing is gained in christian controversy by harsh words; by epithets which tend only to wound the feelings; by personal allusions, or by an imputation of bad motives. Conscious truth will seldom be provoked to such acts of controversy, and the sincere lover of truth will learn to check and restrain all such ebullitions. I had *no* personal allusion or reference in penning the Tract on the position of the Evangelical party. I made mention of no name but in the kindest manner. I used no uncourteous words in regard to the party; I cast no reflection on their motives. It was reasonable to suppose that whatever examination might be made of the Tract, it would be done in a kind spirit, and with a corresponding freedom from personality. There was a way in which the argument in that Tract might have been so met as to have maintained the feelings of brotherhood unimpaired; and it was possible for the Evangelical party in the Episcopal church to have secured the cordial sympathy of the whole Christian community in their struggles against their high church brethren. All that was needed in the case was one of these things:—to show to the satisfaction of the community, that the spirit of Evangelism is not inconsistent with Episcopacy, and may live and flourish there; to explain how it has been that this never *has* occurred, and what new hopes

they have of success when all efforts have heretofore failed; and if such be their belief, to recognise cordially other ministers and churches as true portions of the church of Christ. Or if, pressed by the difficulties of their condition, and despairing of success in a controversy where the odds are so much against them, they should frankly acknowledge that there are things in their Liturgy which are against the spirit of this age; that it was framed in a time when the objects which they now seek were not contemplated by the church; that the Prayer Book might be modified to advantage, and should they imitate the Reformers, and the noble example of the Free Church of Scotland, they would be certain to carry the sympathy of the community with them. They would be certain also to be a more flourishing church than they can now be. They would breathe the air of freedom. The Evangelical spirit would no longer struggle in bonds. They would secure all those in the community who have any affinities for Episcopacy, and who prefer that mode of worship. The high church party would make few converts from other denominations. The few who *might*, from any cause, be disposed to become united with them, would prefer at once to enter the Roman Catholic communion. *Tendimus in Latium seems* to be the appropriate motto of that party, and it would be easier to persuade men to start on a journey at once to Rome, than to persuade them to leave their homes with an intention to end their travels at any place *without* the walls of the Eternal City. Indeed it is a fact about which there can be no doubt, that the converts which have been made of late years to the Episcopal church, have been principally made by the zeal of the low church

party. If that party wished to secure accessions still from other denominations, it was incumbent on them to furnish to the community some guarantee that they who now enter the Episcopal church will not be engaged in a hopeless warfare; will not be obliged to depart from the whole spirit of their rubric and canons, and will not be in danger of being overshadowed and crushed by Puseyism or Romanism.*

In particular, I supposed I had a right to anticipate that the argument in my Tract would be met in a kind manner. When, ten years ago, I examined, with as much freedom as I have shown in this inquiry, the Tract on "Episcopacy tested by Scripture," by the Right Rev. Dr. Onderdonk, the argument was met by him in a spirit and manner wholly becoming the character of a christian and a gentleman. There was not an unkind word uttered; there was no imputation of an improper motive; there was nothing to diminish my high respect for him; there was no charge of misrepresentation, or of disregard for the truth. On his part, the argument was a model in tone and spirit of what an argument conducted by a christian gentleman should be; and I meant, on my part, to reciprocate his kind and gentlemanly treatment. I supposed then, and believe still, that apart from the bearing of the *argument* on truth, good was done by showing on both sides, what has been so rarely seen in

*See the letter of Judge Jay, an eminent Episcopalian, giving reasons for declining to contribute to build an Episcopal church in Westchester County, New York, because there was reason to apprehend that it might yet be brought wholly under the control of the Puseyite party in the Episcopal church. This letter was recently published in the New York Commercial Advertiser.

debates on religion, that a controversy could be conducted without in the least embittering the feelings of those engaged in it, or diminishing mutual respect.

I had the strongest reasons to suppose that the result would be the same in the examination of another important question, pertaining to Episcopacy—the position of the Evangelical party in that church. Some of that party I have had the happiness to reckon among my personal friends, nor has the fact of their preference for Episcopacy above what I have regarded as a better faith, made any diminution in the affection which I have had for them, nor so far as I could perceive, in their respect for me. The Rev. John A. Clark, D. D., late editor of the Recorder, was a personal friend for more than twenty years, and all my intercourse with the present editors has been uniformly of the kindest character. Under these circumstances, and not having any other reference to them in the remarks which I ventured to publish on the position of the party with which they are identified than I had to all others of that party, it was rational to expect that, if my Tract was noticed at all, it would be in the spirit of kindness to which I had been accustomed, and which I had endeavoured myself to evince.

THE MANNER IN WHICH THE INQUIRY HAS BEEN ACTUALLY MET.

To my friends and theirs, it has been a matter of surprise to observe the method which the editors have thought proper to adopt in their reply. The controversy, so far as they are concerned, seems to have become personal, and the attention is diverted

from the *argument* to the *man*. There are two classes of charges or epithets which they have seen proper to employ. Of the former class, are such as these: "Ignorance and misapprehension;" "misrepresentation of facts;" "unjust assaults;" "extreme misrepresentations;" "hostile spirit;" "virulence;" "rudeness;" "the exceeding injustice and misrepresentation of the book:" "*indelicacy* and WANT OF GOOD BREEDING;" "very empty assertions;" an "unprovoked and unnecessary assault;" "mis-statements." The editors speak of themselves as "*insulted*," (that is by this publication, and by the manner in which it is received in the community), and shut out of respectful and decorous reception among those who are accustomed to meet on occasions when christians meet for the purpose of united efforts to spread the gospel."

The other charges are of a more serious character. They relate not to a deficiency of knowledge, or to a necessity of instruction in the rules of etiquette, but to the heart. They pertain to the moral and religious character, and embody express accusations of a determined and wilful disregard of the truth, and of a purpose even to invent and falsify in order to vilify the Episcopal church. The editors speak of "the peculiar exhibition which he has made of ignorance of the facts in the case, and *unconcern for their existence*;" they say that "Mr. Barnes could not *revile* the Liturgy of the church adequately *without* VOLUNTARY *misrepresentations*;" that "these two sentences," (quoted from p. 34 of the Tract,") contain nothing less than two deliberate acts of injustice, *deliberately framed for the mere purpose of inventing increased reproach*;" that "Mr. Barnes' *determination* for

the result he desired *of complete vilification of the Prayer Book*, would not have allowed him this reference." In speaking of the argument which I had submitted on confirmation, the editors indulge themselves in the following language: "With what honesty then can Mr. Barnes occupy eleven pages of his book *in the deliberate framing* of a contrary statement, when a simple reference to our known laws would have exhibited to him the truth at once." *There is here exhibited, just as there is throughout the whole book, the determination to vilify and destroy not the party avowedly the object, but the church to which they belong. There is no 'enquiry' into facts, from one end of the publication to the other, but a succession of unfounded assertions, and imputations* EQUALLY DESTITUTE OF TRUTH AND PROOF." So again the editors say, "In reply to *such perfectly unfounded statements*, we hardly know what to say—the charge seems SO VOLUNTARILY UNTRUE, from a man who professes to have examined the book."

These are certainly very grave charges against a minister of the gospel, and should not have been hastily made. The community will not expect me to reply to them. I may be "ignorant," and if so, it would have been very easy to show me wherein; I may have "misapprehended" some things, and it would have been easy to have shown me the truth; but to "misrepresent *voluntarily*, for the purpose of vilifying;" "deliberately to frame that which is designed to increase reproach;" to "have no concern for the existence of facts," and to make statements which even *seem* to be "voluntarily untrue," is not my character; nor will the declaration of the Editors of the Episcopal Recorder satisfy this

community that it is. They will themselves regret the use of this language on calm reflection, and I shall hasten to forget it as soon as possible. Such language contributes nothing to the discovery of truth, or to the value of an argument. I put these unhappy expressions on record here not for the purpose of replying to them, but to do all in my power to prevent their use hereafter. They shall not be remembered by me in the argument, or in my private intercourse with Episcopalians. The end of discussion is *truth;* and that end will be best reached by clear argument, kind words, and courteous deportment. The atmosphere in which truth resides is clear and serene, in a region elevated far above the mists of prejudice and passion, and to be reached only by a vigorous effort to rise above them. "No pleasure," says Lord Bacon, "is comparable to the standing upon the vantage-ground of truth: (a hill not to be commanded, and where the air is always clear and serene;) and to see the errors, and wanderings, and mists, and tempests in the vale below: so always that this prospect be with pity, and not with swelling or pride." I used kind words, and I shall continue to do so. Hitherto I have had no occasion to notice anything else among those with whom I have had intercourse in the Episcopal church, and I shall give occasion for no other in anything that I have to say. So far as personal intercourse is concerned between me and Episcopalians, everything has been of the kindest character; and so far as I am concerned, nothing shall provoke me to depart from what I have adopted as the rule of my life in my intercourse with all classes of men. Hitherto I have experienced no want of this on the part of Episco-

palians. As a minister, I have had no reason to complain of any interference from them with me—of any effort to draw away my people from my ministry, or in any manner to injure my reputation, or to embarrass me in my work. I have never felt the slightest hesitation to dismiss any one of my members who preferred that communion; nor have I supposed they have had any reluctance to dismiss those to unite with my church who have preferred the Presbyterian mode of worship. The *interchange* of members, if the phrase may be employed, has been to me of a pleasant character. I have honourable testimonials and recommendations from the Episcopal church, in my possession; and in the passing from one church to another, there has been no such disparity of numbers as to cause on my part even momentary jealousy. I have always supposed, that from numerous causes, there are those in a community who would prefer the Episcopal mode of worship to the Presbyterian, and who, perhaps, would be more edified in such a communion; and on the other hand, I have supposed that there were those who would prefer the Presbyterian to the Episcopal, the Methodist, or the Baptist. This is a land of freedom. Every man has a right to select his mode of worship; every minister will find his proper level in the estimation of the community; every one who is worthy of public confidence will find those who will be willing to sit under his ministy; and thus far in life, I for one at least, have had no reason to complain that the public have not shown me all the respect which is my due.

The public will excuse the reference to these personal matters. They would not have been

troubled with it, if the course of the Recorder had not seemed to demand it. I shall make no further allusion of this kind.

Correction of a Misapprehension.

Before proceeding to notice the main subjects of the argument, there is one statement in my Tract, in itself of little importance, which, having been misapprehended, I could wish had been otherwise. It occurs on p. 33, and is introduced by the Editors in the following manner :—

"But could not Mr. Barnes revile the Liturgy of the Church adequately, *without* VOLUNTARY *misrepresentations?*—p. 33, he says, 'There is not even permission given to the minister to select and read a portion of Scripture that shall have any relation to the subject of his discourse. If his text should be 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son,' and the 'lesson' for that day should *happen to be that chapter* of the Book of Chronicles which commences thus, 'Adam, Sheth, Enosh, Mahalaleel, Jared, Henoch, Methuselah, Lamech,' all that the minister is to do is to say, 'Here beginneth such a chapter,' and read on.' "

On this the editors are pleased to make the following remarks :—

"Mr. Barnes knew, for he professes to have accurately examined this Prayer Book, that *no such lesson is appointed on any Sunday or week day throughout the whole year.* And yet he can allow himself to make this deliberately false insinuation, for the purpose of casting an invented reproach upon a book, against which he can find so few real objections. The glory of the Prayer Book, is the honour which it gives to the word of God,—requir-

ing no less than eight distinct portions of Holy Scripture to be read on every Sabbath and other day of public worship, selected with the most remarkable wisdom, to teach continually the great doctrines and truths of the Bible,—while Presbyterian ministers, in many instances, read nothing of it, and Presbyterian congregations hear nothing of it, but the single text which has been selected as the subject for preaching,—and in no instance, is more than one single chapter or part of a chapter read during any occasion of their public worship. Which body will be found to have paid the most honour to the word of God, this with other facts may help to decide."

I would have avoided the occasion for these reflections, if I had supposed that such a construction would have been put on what I said, or that it was possible. But such an idea never occurred to me. I never meant to be understood as saying that the passage from Chronicles was among the "lessons" that were appointed to be read, nor do I now see that it is the fair construction of what I said. I designed merely to show that the minister was not at liberty, from the rules of the Prayer Book, to select the portion of scripture to be read where his text occurred, or to select one that would be pertinent to his subject; and all that I wished to say was, that if his text was one that appertained to the richest truths of the gospel, the "lesson" that was to be read was prescribed, even though it might be as remote as possible from the subject of his discourse. I regret the occasion given for the misconstruction of the passage in my Tract the more, because it was entirely unnecessary if I had *designed* to refer to a "lesson" actually appointed to

be read, which would have illustrated the point before me.

There are numerous parts of the prescribed "lessons" in the Prayer Book, which would have been as pertinent to my purpose as the chapter from Chronicles, and, among others, the following, which *is* appointed to be read, would have answered my design just as well—and my reference may be thus amended. 'There is not even permission given to the minister to select and read a portion of Scripture that shall have any relation to the subject of discourse. If his text should be, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son," and the "lesson" for that day should happen to be that chapter of the Book of *Nehemiah* (x.) which commences thus, "Now those that were sealed were, Nehemiah the Tirshatha, the son of Hachaliah, and Zidkijah, Seraih, Azariah, Jeremiah, Pashur, Amariah, Malchijah, Hattush, Shebaniah, Malluch, Harim, Meremoth, Obadiah," all that the minister is to do, is to say "here beginneth such a chapter," and read on.

THE FIRST MAIN POSITION IN THE ARGUMENT.

In the argument which I maintained in the Tract, the main points on which I insisted were three: First, *that it has never been possible permanently to connect the religion of forms with Evangelical religion* (p. 21.); Second, *that the low church party are compelled to use a liturgy which counteracts the effect of their teaching*, (p. 31); and Third, *that there are no arrangements or provisions in the liturgy for promoting their peculiar and distinctive efforts, or which contemplate such efforts.* (p. 50.) As these were the principal points which I designed

to illustrate, and constituted in fact the substance of the argument, I propose now to notice the manner in which the considerations which I adduced in their support have been met by the Recorder. I then supposed, as I still do, that if these points were made out, the conclusion would be reached, however painful it might be, that the Evangelical party in the Episcopal church are aiming at objects which can never be secured, at least while the Liturgy remains as it is now, and that *as a party*, in the conflicts which have grown up in that church, they are destined to inevitable defeat; that they must either secede from the church, or that the "unity" of the church can only be preserved by their showing that they *prefer* that unity to the distinctive principles which they are aiming to maintain as a party.

I did not charge them with "hypocrisy," as the Editors of the Recorder affirm; I did not say that "these persons are just so much less honest, or less conscientious than either the Puritans or the Methodists, whose separation has been before commended, and whose disinterested sacrifices, for the truth's sake, are held up as so exemplary;" (Recorder, March 16;) but I meant to say that there are difficulties in their way, which, so far as it strikes one out of the Episcopal church, can never be overcome; that the high church party have manifestly the advantage, from the fact that the Prayer Book does not contemplate any such thing as the Evangelical party are aiming to secure, and that if the "unity" of the church is secured, it must be by their abandoning their present "position." Whether this will be done, or whether they will have independence enough to assert the majesty and glory

of the principles which they defend, and to imitate the "Reformers, the Puritans, and the Methodists," *remains to be seen.* Time will determine. I can only say, that I meant to charge on them no lack of firmness or honesty in the maintenance of the Evangelical principles; that I never suspected any low-churchman of "hypocrisy;" and that I have no reason to doubt that they are perfectly honest and sincere in their attachment to the Evangelical views.

The Recorder is right when it says, (March 16,) that the object of my remarks had reference to the Episcopal church as such, and not exclusively to the Evangelical party. I do not, indeed, see or admit the justice of the *language* employed, when the Editors use the word "assault," and when they say that my object was to "destroy, to disparage, and to weaken the only portion of it which he thinks calculated to give a delusively good character to the whole." But I do admit, that my design was to examine *Episcopacy itself;* to show its essential tendency and nature, and to prove that it stands at variance with the principles and aims of the Evangelical party. I chose to consider it in the *best form* in which it has ever appeared, as held by the Evangelical party in this country. I did not doubt, and cannot now, that that party would entirely coincide with me that Episcopacy, as developed in the high church and Oxford party, is anti-evangelical in its character, for all the peculiar aims and efforts of the low church party, as such are based on that supposition, and they have never been sparing in the expression of these views respecting their brethren. On that point, therefore, it might be presumed that we are agreed, and if I

could show that the efforts of the low church party are impracticable, and that those efforts are a departure from what was contemplated in the Prayer Book, the argument would be complete. It remains, then, only to examine the manner in which the positions which I laid down have been met.

The first was, *that it has never been possible permanently to connect the religion of forms with Evangelical religion.* In support of this, I referred to the fact that the Saviour, of design, and with great care, separated his religion from the Jewish religion, which in his time had become a religion of forms; and that he was at great pains to make his religion as simple as possible—prescribing no forms of worship as essential—and selecting, as the rites which he wished to have observed, only two in number, and those of all conceivable, the least susceptible of abuse. I referred to the fact that christianity at the time of Constantine, became a religion of forms; and then showed, that, as a matter of historical fact, whenever, from any cause, the spirit of Evangelism had sprung up in connection with that religion, it had been impossible to blend them, but that a separation had inevitably ensued. I then referred to certain periods when the Evangelical spirit had been revived in the church when the religion of forms prevailed; and showed that in every instance the quickened and animated part had been separated. I referred to the Waldenses, to the Reformers, to the Puritans, and to the followers of Wesley—embracing all the important periods in which God had revived the Evangelical spirit in Prelatical churches, and showing that the result, up to the present effort of the Evangelical party, has been uniform.

THE SENSE IN WHICH THE PHRASE "THE RELIGION OF FORMS" WAS USED.

I used the phrase "Religion of Forms" with no invidious design, but as a matter of convenience. I did not mean to say that the religion referred to was mere *formalism;* or that in connection with that mode of worship there was no spirituality; or that, in the language of the Recorder, "the worship of the Episcopal church is mere form having no spiritual feeling in the worshipper connected with it." I meant to characterise a mode of worship which is distinguished from Puritan simplicity, or, as I believe was the plain matter of fact, from the mode of worship which prevailed in the Christian church in the time of the apostles. I meant to use a term which would be comprehensive enough to embrace *all* churches which use a prescribed form of worship as distinguished from those which object to such prescribed forms, and which suppose that the modes of worship should be left substantially to the discretion of the churches and the ministers. The phrase is intelligible, and is sufficiently distinctive for all practical purposes. Indeed, no one could well mistake its meaning. Any one with a very slight acquaintance with the history and present state of christianity, would run the line without danger of material mistake. On the one side, he would rank the Papal, the Greek, the Armenian, the Coptic, and the Anglo and Anglo-American Episcopal churches; and on the other, the Reformed churches of Geneva and France, the Lutheran, the Reformed Dutch, the Presbyterian of Scotland and America, the Congregationalist, the Baptist, and the Methodist. To speak of one of these classes as "the Religion of Forms," is not to say that the worship is

"formalism," or that there is *no* religion in connection with them, but it is to speak of them as distinguished from another large portion of the christian world. After considering the remarks of the Recorder of March 16, and April 6, I see no objection still to the use of the term, and meaning nothing invidious by it, shall continue, for convenience, still to employ it.

The Recorder has not called in question the truth *of the facts* to which I referred respecting the church in the time of the Saviour, the Waldenses, the Reformers, the Puritans, and the Wesleys. Those facts could not be denied, for they are settled matters of history, and they may be allowed to stand for what they are worth—as demonstrating what I intended, that until the present effort of the Episcopal party, it has never been possible permanently to connect the Religion of Forms with Evangelical Religion.

THE REPLY OF THE RECORDER TO MY MAIN POSITION.

The only attempt on the part of the editors of the Recorder to meet this argument, is in the following words :—

"The author says p. 21—that 'the attempt to unite the religion of forms with the Gospel has been often made.' He instances 'the Jewish religion in the time of our Saviour as a religion of forms.' But what outward reflection raised up a party of spiritual worshippers then? Then Christianity itself from the time of Constantine became a religion of forms. The Reformation was the result of the evangelical party which finally grew up within it. But what reflection was there from abroad? The Church of England, immediately after the Reforma-

tion was a religion of forms. And the Puritans to the number of 'two thousand of the best men in the English Church' left it in a single day. What outward reflection raised up this party then? Then again, the Church of England became a religion of forms,— until Wesley and Whitfield, &c., were brought forth as another party of the same description. What outward reflection was then at work with such amazing power? If all these growths have taken place in the body of a church, which was at the same time a mere formal church, how absurd becomes the position that the present similar party, as it is assumed to be, in the Episcopal Church, owes its existence wholly to the mere reflection from better churches, with which it is encompassed. The more rational conclusion would be, from the author's own premises, that there was something in the nature of that church which he calls a mere religion of forms, adapted to produce a result which has been so uniformly seen to flow from it. Of course, the question whether this party should have separated from the church in which it grew, is not now before us for consideration. But all Mr. Barnes' adduced facts are directly in hostility with the conclusion which he draws from them; laying down the principle that the spiritual or evangelical principle, can only be united with the religion of forms, by some outward influence, and then illustrating it, by a succession of instances, in which he is obliged to concede that there was no such influence existing. We do not mean to enter in this article into the merits of the important questions which arise in connection with these assertions,—but merely to point out the loose and unsub-

stantial assertions, which this author would have his readers consider as correct reasoning."

The argument here is, that the spirit of Evangelism has *sprung up*, or has been *originated* in connection with the religion of forms. This is a different position from the one which I laid down, and which the Editors have thought it not proper to disturb—that it has not been possible *permanently to connect* the two—but, nevertheless, it is worth inquiry whether *this* is so. The position of the Recorder is, that the spirit of Evangelism has often *sprung up* in connection with the religion of forms, or if the phrase is preferred, in the bosom of Prelatical churches. Let us inquire whether it is so. That the spirit of evangelism has *existed for a time* in such a connection, is implied by my argument, and is undeniable. The efforts of the low church party in this country prove it. The question is as to its *origin;* whether it is to be traced to Prelacy —to the religion of forms—to the regular working of the Prayer Book — or to some *foreign* influence.

In my Tract, I ventured to lay down the following position:—

"It is well known that there have been, perhaps from the commencement of its existence in this country, two parties in the Episcopal church. These parties are generally known by the names of the high and the low church—or as the latter prefer, we believe, to be called, the Evangelical party. These parties have grown up, not from the nature of Prelacy, or by any tendency in the Episcopal church to foster the aims sought by the Evangelical party, but from the contact of Episcopacy with the spirit of our age, and with the free developements of Christianity

among the other denominations with whom Episcopalians come necessarily in contact. It is possible that the germs of these parties existed in the Episcopal church in its incipient state in this country, but that which has now grown up into the evangelical party, we suppose would have been suppressed by the overshadowing of the religion of forms, if it had not been excited and kindled by the reflected influence on the Episcopal church of the views and objects of evangelical christians in other denominations. It has been apparent that other denominations greatly surpassed the Episcopal communion in zeal for those things specially commended in the New Testament; that they sought a more spiritual religion than had been common in the Episcopal communion; that they aimed more to convert and save the souls of men; and that they sought in methods that had the undoubted sanction of the New Testament, to spread the gospel around the globe. The question arose whether these objects could not be grafted on Episcopacy, and whether without producing schism, and with the maintenance of the highest respect for Prelacy and for the forms of religion, it was not possible to introduce the evangelical spirit into the bosom of the Episcopal church, and to what was regarded as the nobleness, venerableness, and authority of her ancient forms, add the life and vigour and elastic energy, which reigns with such power in other denominations. If so, it seems to have been supposed, there might be urged in favour of Prelacy all that is now urged from the necessity of the 'apostolic succession;' all the authority of the Fathers; all its boasted power to preserve the unity of the church; and all the advantage derived from a staid and regular organization, united with all that

commends evangelical religion to the hearts and consciences of men."

The question now is, whether this sentiment is correct, or whether the position of the Recorder is the true one. It would have been, perhaps, more satisfactory if the Recorder *had* "entered into the merits of the important questions which arise in connection with these assertions." As I regard the point now before us as furnishing an opportunity of making *an advance* in the inquiry into the essential tendency of all "religions of forms," it is *my* intention *to* enter, somewhat minutely, into the examination of these "important questions." It will be convenient to take up the points referred to in order, and if I am wrong in the position, it will be very easy to show it.

The Argument from the Jewish Community.

(1.) The first relates to the source of the evangelical or spiritual influence in the Jewish community. The Recorder asks with some appearance of triumph, "what outward reflection raised up a party of spiritual worshippers then?" The answer to this is easy, and it is a matter of surprise that it should have escaped the notice of the Editors of the Recorder. It was the "foreign" influence introduced by the Son of God, sent from heaven. It never originated in the bosom of the Jewish community; it was no part of the working of their system of forms; it was the result of none of the aims of the Pharisees, the Sadducees, or the Essenes. It had no connection with the religion of forms there, except that the Saviour was born a Jew; but was in its spirit, its origin, its aims, wholly from abroad—and the Saviour took good care that the spirit of

evangelism which he originated should not be in danger of being frozen in the germ by being connected with the prevailing religion of forms, or with any other.

If it should be said here, that God himself instituted the Jewish religion as a religion of forms, and that, therefore, the argument which I employed on the subject, is a "sophism," I would reply, that it is true that God instituted that religion, and that it was, to a certain extent, a religion of forms. But some other things are also true. (1.) It is true that it had *not* some of the things that go to make up the religion of forms under Christianity. It had no stereotyped liturgy in forms of prayer which were always used in the temple service, or in the synagogue. (2.) It became *as* formal a religion as it could be. The experiment was fairly made, and after a trial of some fifteen hundred years, its tendency was seen; all spirituality had ceased; it was declared to be a 'burden which could not be borne,' and it gave way to a more spiritual mode of worship. There were important reasons which could easily be stated, why religion should, at that time, and among that people, have as much of form as it had, and it was *worth* one well-tried experiment to convince the world of the tendency of such a religion, and to show the impracticability of blending a religion of forms with evangelical or spiritual religion. Did it work well? Did it show that it was well adapted to become the religion of the world? Did the Saviour show that he was disposed to perpetuate and enlarge the experiment? See Heb. viii. 7, 10, 12.: "For if that first covenant had been *faultless*, then should no place have been found for the second." "This is the covenant which I will

make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws in their mind, and write them in their hearts." "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that *which decayeth and waxeth old*, is ready to vanish away." Heb. ix. 9, 10. "Which was a figure *for the time then present*, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience. Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them *until the time of reformation*." Such is Paul's view of the ancient religion of forms. Indeed, the whole design of the Epistle to the Hebrews is to win those whom the author addressed from their attachment to that religion of forms; to prevent their return to it; to show them that Christianity had all that was truly great and divine which there was in the ancient system, with none of its disadvantages; and to show them, that though it had no gorgeous rites and ceremonies such as then were in the temple, it was far better fitted to secure the salvation of the soul. If outward forms were so well adapted to promote spiritual religion as Episcopalians seem to suppose, can they well explain how it was that the Saviour did not seek to retain what there was of form, and pomp, and splendour, in the Jewish worship, and to incorporate it with his religion? Will they show why it was that he so effectually separated his own church from that religion, and instituted a mode of worship with the fewest conceivable forms of devotion? And will they explain how it was, that the constant tendency of that religion was to lose all spirituality, and to degenerate into a cold and heart-

less formalism, from which neither prophets nor judgments could arouse its votaries? Perhaps the world has never since furnished a more striking illustration of the inevitable tendency of the religion of forms than the Jewish religion was in the time of the Saviour.

The Argument from the Reformation.

(2.) The next point referred to by the Editors of the Recorder, is the Reformation. There were at that time in the bosom of the Papal church true and spiritually minded christians, to whom the Reformation is to be traced. The Editors do not attempt to deny my position in regard to them, that they found it impracticable to remain in connection with the Papacy, and that they were obliged to separate from the religion of forms; but they impliedly affirm, that the piety of the Reformers was the fruit of that religion, and that the reviving spirit of piety was to be traced to no foreign influence. "What reflection," say they, "was there from abroad?" A very slight knowledge of history will enable any one to answer this question, and to determine whether the light which beamed on the mind of Luther and Melancthon, on Farel, Viret and Calvin, nay, on the mind of Erasmus, was light reflected from Papal forms and ceremonies. The light which Luther saw was that which beamed from the pages of the volume of Scripture which he had in his cell, and not from the gorgeous vestments, processions, and imposing splendor of the Papal ritual. The observing of the Papal ceremonies at Rome, confirmed his growing abhorrence of the rites of that mode of worship, and impressed upon his soul,

by contrast, in a manner which neither time, persecution, nor obloquy could obliterate, the declaration, "the just shall live by faith." But apart from this, is any one ignorant that the growing light in Europe which preceded the Reformation, and which contributed to it, and which made it practicable at all, was from a foreign influence? The reviving literature of that age had not its origin in the Papal communion; the growing love of freedom, and the large and liberal views which appeared in the north of Germany, and which sustained the Reformation, were not originated in the bosom of the Papal communion, nor did the Papacy foster those views when they came in from abroad. A century before Luther appeared, Wickliffe, Huss, and Jerome of Prague, had felt on their souls the impress of truth originated by the Bible; but the power of that religion crushed the tender germ of piety, and it was not until a foreign influence had moulded Europe in an insensible manner for a century longer, that the evangelical spirit of Luther was saved from being crushed by the same religion of forms. The Waldenses had been ejected, and were crushed as far as the Papal power could crush them; Huss and Jerome were burned at the stake, the bones of Wickliffe were dug up and burned; Luther was excommunicated and anathematized; the Inquisition was originated to crush and extinguish the growing spirit of Evangelism in the Papal church; all the power of the Papacy was employed to exclude that spirit, or to extinguish it in Italy and Spain; the Duke of Alva deluged the Low Countries with the blood of those who had exchanged a religion of forms for spiritual religion, and from neither Pope, nor Cardinal, nor Archbish-

op, nor Bishop, nor Priest, did the spirit of Evangelism, as it appeared at the Reformation, find a patron.

The Argument from the Puritans.

(3.) The next reference of the Recorder is to the Puritans in England. This reference is in the following words, 'The Church of England, immediately after the Reformation, was a religion of forms. And the Puritans, to the number of "two thousand of the best men in the English church, left it in a single day." *What outward reflection raised up this party then?*' The idea of the Recorder seems to be, that the Puritan spirit was originated wholly in the bosom of the Episcopal church in England, and was sustained by it; that it was to be traced to no foreign and reflected influence; and that to the fostering care of that kind and indulgent mother in the days of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., under the auspices of Laud and his meek fellow-labourers, this spirit had been so carefully nourished that "two thousand of the best men in the church" were prepared to leave it. They who are acquainted with the history of the Puritans, will ask with some degree of interest, if not of surprise, what there was in the Episcopal church of those times which was so skilfully adapted to originate and sustain the Puritan spirit. They will wonder how it was that that spirit grew under the administration of Laud, and what there was in the Restoration of the amiable Charles II. that was so favourable to its growth. To most readers of the History of England, it has seemed that there was a very marked difference between the aims of the Puritans, and those which prevailed in the established

church; that there was little in that church, in the times referred to, to foster their Evangelical spirit; that they met with some not unimportant obstructions in the maintenance of their views, from the days of Elizabeth to those of Charles II.; that they had doubts about the propriety of many things in the church which appeared to them to savor much of the religion of forms; and that their *peculiar* views as Puritans grew up, not in virtue of anything *in* the church, but in spite of every attempt to crush them.

But still, the Recorder asks "What outward reflection raised up this party then?" Was there any foreign influence which had any agency in cherishing and moulding the Puritan spirit? Was there any reflection from a foreign church which contributed any thing to make the Puritan what he was? These questions I am able to answer in eloquent words and thoughts. I copy from the speech of the Hon. Rufus Choate before the New England Society in New York, Dec. 1843. I make the extract on account of its own singular beauty and value, as well as for its bearing on my argument. It is long; but I shall be doing service by inducing any one to read it who has not seen it before:

"Puritanism was planted in the region of storms, and there it grew. Swayed this way and that by a whirlwind of blasts, all adverse, it sent down its roots below frost, or drought, on the bed of the avalanche. Its trunk went up erect, gnarled, seamed, not riven by the bolt; the evergreen enfolded its branches, its blossom was like to that ensanguined flower, inscribed with woe.

"One influence there was, however, on the history of English Puritanism whose permanent and

various effect on its doctrines, character and destinies, is among the most striking things in the whole history of opinion. I mean its contact with the republican reforms of the Continent, and particularly those of Geneva. In all its stages, all the disciples of the Reformation, wherever they lived, were, in some sense, a single brotherhood, whom a diversity of speech, hostility of governments, and remoteness of place, could not wholly keep apart. Local persecutions drew the tie the closer. In the reign of Mary, from 1553 to 1558, a thousand learned Englishmen fled from the stake, at home, to the happier seats of Continental Protestantism. Of them, great numbers, I know not how many, came to Geneva. There they awaited the death of the Queen; and then, sooner or later, but in the time of Elizabeth went back to England. *I ascribe to that five years in Geneva an influence that has changed the history of the world.* I seem to myself to trace to it, as an influence on the English race, a new theology, a new politics, another tone of character, the opening of another era of time and of liberty. I seem to myself to trace to it, a portion, at least, of the objects of the great civil war in England, the Republican constitution framed in the cabin of the Mayflower, the divinity of Jonathan Edwards, the battle of Bunker Hill, and the Independence of America. In that brief season, English Puritanism was changed fundamentally and forever. Why should we think this so extraordinary? There are times when whole years pass over the head of a man, and work no change of mind at all. There are others, again, when in an hour, old things pass away, and all things become new. A verse of the Bible, a glorious line of some old poet, dead a thou-

sand years before, the new-made grave of a child, a friend killed by a thunderbolt, as in the case of Luther, some single more than tolerable pang of 'despised love,' some single more intolerable act of the 'oppressor's wrong and proud man's contumely,' the gleam of rarer beauty on the lake or in the sky, something higher than the fall of a leaf, or a bird's song on the shore, draws tears from him, in the twinkling of an eye.—When, before or since, in the history of the world was the human character subjected to an accumulation of agents, so fitted to create it all anew, as those which encompassed the English exiles at Geneva?

"I do not make much account in this of the *material* grandeur and beauty which burst on their astonished senses, as around the solitudes of Patmos. It is of the *moral* agents of change of which I would speak. Passing over the theology which they learned there, consider the politics they learned there. Consider that the asylum into which they had been admitted, the city which had opened its arms to pious and learned men, banished by an English throne, and an English hierarchy, was a republic. In the giant hands of guardian mountains, ascending from their 'silent sea of pines,' above the thunder clouds, and reposing there, calmly, amidst their encircling stars, while the storm raved by, below; before which forests, and the cathedral-tombs of kings went down; on the banks of a contrasted lake, lovelier than a dream of fairy-land, in a valley which might have been hollowed out to enclose the last home of liberty, there smiled an independent, peaceful, law abiding, and prosperous commonwealth. ***There was a state without king or nobles, there was a church without a bishop;***

there was a people, governed by laws of their own making, and by rules of their own choosing. And to the eye of these exiles, bruised and pierced through, by the accumulated oppressions of a civil and spiritual tyranny, to whom there were coming tidings, every day, out of England, that another victim had been struck down, on whose dear still home in the sea there fell, every day, a gloomier shadow from the frowning turrets of power; was not that republic the brightest image in the whole transcendent scene? Do you doubt that they turned from Alpine beauty and Alpine grandeur, to look, with a loftier emotion, for the first time in their lives, on the serene, unveiled statue of Classical Liberty? Do you not think that this spectacle, in their circumstances, and in their moods, prompted pregnant doubts, daring hopes, new ideas, 'thoughts that wake to perish never,' doubts, hopes, ideas, and thoughts, of which a new age is born? Was it not then and there that the dream of Republican Liberty, a dream to be realized somewhere, perhaps in England, perhaps in some region of the western sun, first mingled itself with the general impulses and the general hopes of the Reformation? Was that dream ever let go, down to the morning of that day, when the Pilgrim Fathers met in the cabin of their shattered bark, and then, as she rose and fell on the stern New England sea, and the voices of the November forests rang through her torn topmast rigging, subscribed the first republican constitution of the New World? I confess myself to be of the opinion of those who trace to that spot and to that time the Republicanism of the Puritans. I confess, too, that I love to trace the pedigree of our trans-Atlantic liberty, thus backwards, through

Switzerland, to its native land of Greece. I think this is the true line of succession, down which it has descended. I agree with Swift, and Dryden, and Bishop Burnet, in that hypothesis. There was a liberty, no doubt, which the Puritans found, and kept, and improved, in England. They would have changed it, but were not able. But that was a kind of liberty, which admitted and demanded an inequality of man, an insubordination of ranks, a favoured eldest son, *the ascending orders of a hierarchy*, the vast and constant pressure of a superincumbent crown. It was the liberty of Feudalism. It was the liberty of a united monarchy, overhung and shaded by the imposing architecture of great antagonist elements of the state. Such was not the form of liberty which our fathers brought with them. Allowing, of course, for that anomalous relation to the English crown three thousand miles off, it was republican freedom as perfect the moment they stepped on the rock as it is to-day. It had not all been born in the woods of Germany; or between the Elbe and the Ider, or on the level of Runnymede. It was the child of other climes and other days. It sprang to life in Greece. It gilded, next, the early and the middle age of Italy. It then reposed in the hollow breast of the Alps. It descended, at length, on the iron-bound coast of New England, 'and set the stars of glory there.' At every stage of its course, in every new reappearance, it was guarded by some new security; it was embodied in some new element of order; it was fertile of some larger good; it glowed with a more exceeding beauty. Speed its way, and perfect its nature!

" 'Take, freedom! take thy radiant round,
When dimmed, revive, when lost return!
Till not a shrine on earth be found,
On which thy glory shall not burn!' "

One question may be asked here. Who can tell how much this foreign influence, thus derived from *Geneva*, has contributed to make the Episcopal church what it has been in its best days in England and America? The Episcopal church, in its articles, and in the best spirit which has reigned in it, owes a debt to Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, and John Calvin, which it has not yet fully acknowledged.

The Argument from the Methodist Secession.

(4.) The next allusion in the argument of the Editors, is to Wesley and Whitefield. 'Then again the church of England became a religion of forms, until Wesley and Whitefield, &c., were brought forth as another party of the same description. "*What outward reflection*," say they, "*was then at work with such amazing power?*"' To this I reply: Wesley, and Whitefield, and Fletcher, and the little band with whom Methodism originated, were indeed born in the Episcopal church, and were reared in it. God breathed on their hearts, and they gave themselves in the University to the study of the Bible, and not to the study of the Prayer Book. In the church of England at that time, as all know who have ever read the history of Methodism, there was nothing either to originate or foster the spirit of piety which God had implanted in their youthful hearts. It was over the coldness, and formality, and deadness of that same Episcopal church, that they wept, and fasted, and

prayed. Do the Editors of the Recorder mean to be understood as saying, that at that time there was anything in the prevailing spirit of piety in Oxford, or in the established church anywhere, that originated the feelings which warmed the hearts of John and Charles Wesley? Do they mean to say that that spirit was fostered and patronised by the Episcopal church at that time? In the Heads of the Universities; in the Archbishops and Bishops of the land; in the great body of the ministers, and in the prevailing spirit in the members of the church, did they find a response to the warm and elevated aspirations of religion which animated their souls? Can these Editors have been ignorant—one of whom was once connected with that persuasion himself—in what way the zeal of the Wesleys was met in the University; in what way the very *name* "Methodist" was originated, and how the labors of Whitefield and the Wesleys were regarded by the establishment? The established church patronised them very much as it did the Puritans; and after years of toil, and prayer, and tears, in as honest an effort as was ever made for anything, to blend the religion of forms and the Evangelical spirit of "Methodism;" the followers of Wesley bade farewell forever to the church of their fathers, and breathed the pure air of freedom in a separate organisation. Between them and the religion of the Episcopal church, there was no beating of heart against heart; no response of affection; and no kindling sympathy of soul. What has the Methodist church *ever* owed to Episcopacy, except the privilege of withdrawing from it? And how has the fostering care of that establishment ever contributed anything to promote its growth, except as our

mother country contributed to freedom in the United States, by making a total separation necessary? If there was ever an honest effort made to infuse into a religion of forms a pure Evangelical spirit, it was that which was made by the Wesleys to breathe it into the established church of England. If ever there was a spirit of foreign growth, it was the spirit of Methodism springing up in the Episcopal church; if ever there was any experiment that was conclusively settled to be impracticable, it was the honest attempt then made to infuse the Evangelical spirit of the Wesleys into the established church of England.

How will the Editors of the Recorder explain the fact that they were constrained, as the Puritans had been before them, to separate forever from the church of their fathers? If the evangelical spirit is congenial with the religion of forms, why did they not remain there? Why were they not fostered and patronised? Why did not the Heads of the Universities, and the prelates and priests of the land, press them to their bosom as fellow laborers? They did not separate on account of doctrines—for their doctrines would have been tolerated then, as they are now. They were not ejected for want of talent or learning, for England had few better scholars, and no men of higher talent for a great work, than John Wesley. "The church" did not refuse its fostering care because they were not good men—for England had no better men than they were; and until some better solution shall be proposed, I am constrained to abide by the view which I before expressed, that the separation of the Wesleys and of Whitefield was just one illustration of my main po-

sition of the "impossibility of permanently blending evangelical religion with the religion of forms."

The argument from Episcopacy in our own country.

(5.) The next illustration of this subject is derived from our own country. I had said in my Tract (p. 9), 'that these parties have grown up, not from the nature of prelacy, or by any tendency in the Episcopal church to foster the aims sought by the Evangelical party, but from the contact of Episcopacy with the spirit of our age, and with the free developements of Christianity among the other denominations with whom Episcopalians come necessarily in contact.' To this the editors say in reply, "If all these growths have taken place in the body of a church which was at the same time a formal church—how absurd becomes the position that the present similar party, as it is assumed to be, in the Episcopal church, owes its existence wholly to the reflection from better churches with whom it is encompassed. The more rational conclusion would be, from the author's own premises, that there was something in the nature of that church which he calls a mere religion of forms" (a thing, by the way, which I have not done) "adapted to produce a result which has been seen so uniformly to have flowed from it." Whether the result has been "*uniform*" that the religion of forms has originated an evangelical spirit, is not the point now before us. The only "uniformity," so far as appears, has been, that whenever that spirit *has* been originated in such a connection, it has been impossible to blend them, and there has been a certain separation—as in the case of the Waldenses, at the Reformation, among the Puritans, and in the case of the Wesleys.

The question now is, whether the evangelical spirit in the Episcopal church in this land has been originated "*by something in the nature of that church*," and has been "fostered" by it? Or is it to be traced to a foreign influence—to the "reflection" from the better churches with which it is encompassed?

This is an enquiry into a fact. It would be very natural then to ask at what time the Evangelical party in the Episcopal church had its origin? It would be obvious to enquire what was the general character of the Episcopal church in Virginia, in the Carolinas, and elsewhere in the colonies, before the American Revolution? How many of them opened their pulpits to the labors of Whitefield? How many embraced John Wesley when he even still professed to belong to the establishment? How many participated in the revival of religion in the time of the "great awakening?" And it is natural also to ask what classes of men compose the present Evangelical party in the church, and what influences have been made to bear on them in their early training? On this subject, I am in possession of some facts which have much influenced my mind, of a private character, and which I do not think it proper to introduce into an argument before the public. To the present standing and usefulness of those referred to they would be by no means dishonorable but they would show that that party is not a little indebted to "a reflected influence from other denominations."—I deem it proper, in an argument of this kind, to refer only to things of a public nature. From the Episcopal Recorder of January 27, 1844, I take the following statement :—

"Of the American bishops who have joined the

church from other denominations, are the following: Jarvis, Provoost, Bass, Chase, Brownell, Ravenscroft, Smith, Otey, and Lee. Of two hundred and eighty-five persons ordained by Bishop Griswold, two hundred and seven came into the ministry of the Episcopal church from other denominations. At least two-thirds of the clergy of the churches in this country were not educated Episcopalians. And within the last thirty years, about three hundred *ministers* of other denominations have entered the ministry of the Episcopal church."

So also in the paper of February 3, 1844, the Editors say—

"The real cause of all the hostility (to the Episcopal church) is the remarkable increase of the Episcopal church *by additions from other denominations of christians.*"

Of the correctness of these statements, I have no means of judging, but have no disposition to call them in question. Nor have I any of determining from what "other *denominations*," (not *churches*, I presume,) the "two hundred and seven persons ordained by Bishop Griswold," nor the "three hundred '*ministers* of *other denominations*'" who have been transferred into "*clergymen*" of the "*church*" came, but it may be presumed that most of them came from Evangelical "denominations." A few have been received from the Roman Catholic church, but it is not probable that they are included here, as it would not be necessary to "ordain" them; and there is a bare possibility that a few may have gone into the Episcopal church from the Unitarians, or Friends. The mass, probably, have been Methodists; and a small portion of them, we know, have been Presbyterians. If these state-

ments are true, is it unnatural to ask the Editors of that paper whether there is not some reason to believe, that, in accordance with the statement which I made, the evangelical influence in that communion may be *somehow* connected with "the reflected influence on the Episcopal church of the views and objects of Evangelical christians in other denominations?"

No one can be blind to the fact that the very leaders of the Evangelical party in the Episcopal church are themselves men who may *possibly owe something* to this foreign influence, and do *something* to show that there is no very direct tendency *in Episcopacy* to originate the spirit of Evangelism. The "Bishop of Michigan," and the assistant Bishop of Virginia, were trained in the bosom of the Presbyterian church; the "Bishop of Ohio" may possibly owe something to the fact that he received his theological training at Princeton, after the views of the "straitest sect" in the Presbyterian church; and not a few of the present members of the Evangelical party, if I am correct in what I suppose to be true, have been somewhat indebted to Princeton, to Andover, and to New Haven. It is natural to ask whether, whatever Evangelical efforts may have resulted from the labors of "Bishops Jarvis, Provoost, Bass, Chase, Brownell, Ravenscroft, Smith, Otey, and Lee," may not be regarded as somehow connected with a foreign influence, introduced into the Episcopal church? And if it be true that "two-thirds of the clergy" are from abroad, am I wrong in supposing that the Evangelical spirit may have grown up from the "contact of Episcopacy with other denominations?" I refer to these facts not at all to the disparagement or the

disadvantage of that portion of the Episcopal church, for I regard their early training as a thing for which they should unfeignedly thank God, and believe that their uncommon usefulness in "*the* church" has been in no small degree owing to this fact. I cannot doubt that they would have all been *more* useful if they had not left the churches of their fathers, and that they are doomed to be cramped in their efforts to do good as long as they are connected with a religion of forms. Had they continued to breathe the Puritan air of freedom, they would have escaped the evils into which they have now fallen, in an impracticable and hopeless attempt to infuse the Evangelical spirit into the Episcopal church. Will they regard the remark as invidious, that if the Evangelical portion of these accessions had continued to breathe that pure air, the Episcopal church would have been now saved from the dreaded apprehension of schism, and would have remained calmly and coldly "*one?*"

But what has been the fact about the "fostering care" of the Episcopal church for the Evangelical spirit as it now exists in her bosom? I have endeavoured to show that *till* now that spirit has never found a cordial reception or a permanent home in the Episcopal church. I had ventured to say in my Tract, (p. 9,) that the existence of that party has not been owing to 'any tendency in the Episcopal church to foster the aims of that party.' I have referred to the manner in which, in former times, the Waldenses, Wickliffe, Huss, Jerome, Luther, the Puritans, and the Methodists, have been met in their attempts to infuse the Evangelical spirit into the religion of forms. What now is the truth about the present efforts of the Evangelical party?

Are they met with a kind and cordial response from their brethren? Are they pressed with fraternal affection to their bosoms, and are their peculiar plans and aims welcomed in the Episcopal church? Do the "Bishops and other clergy" regard their efforts as being in entire accordance with the spirit of their canons and articles? Do they consider the objects which, as a party, they are endeavoring to promote, as in entire accordance with the Prayer Book? Does the Evangelical church party find a cordial co-operation from their brethren in their efforts to promote revivals; in their prayer meetings; in "associations" or "protracted meetings," and in their readiness to mingle with other denominations in societies for distributing the Bible and Tracts? And have the low church party never felt that they were engaged in a struggle of some kind with a large and very influential majority in their own church? To ask these questions is to answer them. There is no concealment of their opinions on the part of the high church portion of the church, and if we may judge from their published views, and their open acts, there is among them about the same disposition to "foster" the efforts of the low church which there was in the time of James and Charles I. to patronise the Puritans, or of George of Hanover, to give countenance to the Wesleys. Whether I am right or wrong in the view which I have taken, of one thing I am morally certain, that I accord with some twenty or more of the prelates of the Episcopal church; with the great majority of their clergy; and with some of their leading papers, in the opinion that the evangelical influence is of foreign origin, and is to be repressed as soon as possible.

The Evangelical Spirit has never been originated by the Religion of Forms.

(6.) There remains but one other point to settle the inquiry, whether it is the tendency of the religion of forms to originate or foster the evangelical spirit, or whether, if it ever exists, it is a foreign ingredient. This is a simple appeal to fact, and to the efforts of evangelical Episcopalians themselves. The Papal communion has stood, substantially unchanged, longer by far than any civil kingdom has done. It has been throughout a religion of forms. Has it ever originated or "fostered" a spirit of evangelism? The Greek church is also a religion of forms; was blended long with the church of Rome; in the growing dissensions which ultimately led to a separation, it adherred still to the same forms, and now for some eight hundred years has illustrated, by independent action, and on the fair fields, too, where religion once flourished in its purity, the tendency of the religion of forms. Has the evangelical spirit ever been originated and fostered in her bosom? The Armenian, the Nestorian, and the Coptic churches, have throughout their history, been known substantially as religions of form. They, too, through many centuries, and in different climes, have had every opportunity for illustrating the tendency of their systems, and with the same result. Have the purposes and aims which the Evangelical Party are seeking to secure in the Episcopal church in this country, ever been originated among those churches? Is it not true that whatever evangelical influence there is *now* either in the Armenian or the Nestorian churches, has been by a foreign agency, and chiefly from other churches than Episcopal? And is it not true,

that the attempt to revive those churches, and to breathe into them the pure spirit of the gospel, has encountered greater obstructions from the overshadowing of the religion of forms, than have been met with from the degraded natives of Ceylon, or the wretched savages of the Sandwich Islands?*

* The manner in which Episcopalians in this country regard the comparative value of forms, orders, and the evangelical spirit among those churches, may be learned from the following rather caustic letter of the Nestorian bishop, Mar Yohannan.

"My brethren of the Episcopalians:

What evil or wicked thing have I wrought in relation to you, that some of you should write about me in your Newspapers, and scatter them through all America? I am a poor man, and my nation is poor. I came to thank Christians in this country for having helped us, and to ask them to help us more, for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. We are members one of another.——Well; if you had desired our good, would you not sometimes have inquired of me thus: What is the condition of your people in that land of heathens? Is there a church there? Are there good men? Are there tokens of the influence of the Holy Spirit? What is the state of knowledge and instruction? What are the morals? But from very few of you have I heard one of these questions. You ask, *how many orders have you?* My friends, *forms* are nothing. "Neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature."——Shall we place our confidence in name, or forms? No; but in the Lamb of God, who descended from his throne on high to save that which was lost. Observe and behold. The Creator of the heights and the depths did not demean himself so loftily as some denominations, who say, WE ARE; *there is no other true church.*——Your church came out from the church of the Pope. Is there not some leaven of the Pope still remaining in many of you?——What are those *pictures* in some of your churches? This is a mark of the Pope.——Mark that second commandment,—Thou shalt not make unto thee any likeness of anything in heaven above, nor in the earth beneath, nor in the waters under the earth. Another com-

And is it not true, moreover, that the Episcopalians of this country have themselves so little confidence that a religion of forms will ever originate or foster an evangelical spirit, that *their* principal efforts in the cause of foreign missions are exhausted in those very churches, and that their hopes of success

mandment of God is, Love your neighbours as yourselves.—But you say, OUR CHURCH IS GREAT. Very well. Your church has become great, has it? Why? That it may despise small churches? Our Lord says,—whoever will be greatest, let him be *servant* of all. This haughtiness is another mark of the *Pope*, who teaches that none will be saved who are out of his church.——Come let us see; has our Lord pronounced blessings on the *proud*, or on the *meek*?——I do not say your way [church polity] is not a good one,—very good, if you properly follow it; not in exclusiveness and ostentation, saying we are *the only true church;* nor in hypocrisy.——I love Episcopalians, and Congregationalists, and Presbyterians, and Dutchmen, and Lutherans, and Methodists, and Baptists,—all, *as brethren in Christ.*——We open our churches to their Priests, and receive them as the Priests of God.——Our Lord said—whosoever receiveth a Prophet in the name of a Prophet, shall receive a Prophet's reward.——Thus have we learned from our Lord.

You are displeased with me, are you, because I have associated with the Presbyterians and Congregationalists?——I do not practise partiality. Is it very strange, that I associate most with Presbyterians and Congregationalists? No. They are equally our brethren; and they have come and helped us in books and teachers, and have done a great and good work for our nation. Ought I to abandon them?——It would be a black reproach and a great sin for us thus to abuse the good they have done for us. God would be displeased with us for such—ingratitude. But we will never be unmindful of their beneficence.——Shall we abuse the good work which they have done for us? Never. We must obey God rather than man.——We all have one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is over all and in all; over us, over you,

in foreign lands are dependent, more or less, on their availing themselves of the labors of Congregational and Presbyterian missionaries in infusing an Evangelical spirit into those very communions? What hope do even Episcopalians themselves entertain that the Evangelical spirit will ever revive or live in the Armenian, the Greek, the Nestorian, and the Coptic churches without foreign aid?

I have now stated all that seems necessary to urge in the defence and illustration of my first position, that it has never been possible permanently to connect the religion of forms with evangelical religion, and having noticed all that the Editors of the Recorder have deemed it of importance to say in reply, I am quite willing to leave the point for the calm consideration of the public. Probably the public will judge that something more is necessary to invalidate the position than has yet been advanced.

The second general position in the argument.

I proceed, therefore, to notice the reply which has been given to the second general position which is laid down in my Tract. It is, that the low church party "*are compelled to use a liturgy which counteracts the effect of their teaching.*" In support of this, I assumed that they are the friends of revivals, of sabbath schools, of missions and of efforts for the immediate conversion of sinners. I

and over them, and will judge us all at the last day; and if found at his right hand, will raise us all to the same heaven. We shall dwell in *peace together there*. May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God the Father, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with us all forever. Amen.

Your—unworthy Christian brother,

Mar Yohannan."

November, 1842.

took it for granted that they did not believe or teach the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, or the *opus operatum* of the sacraments in any way; that they hold and teach as sincerely as others do the great doctrines of the Reformation, and are warm friends of the methods which have in general been adopted by all christians of the present time, to promote spiritual religion. I judged that I was only doing them simple justice by supposing that these were their aims, and in these things I supposed they were particularly distinguished from the high church party. The Prayer Book, however, I regarded as adapted to a different age, and as not contemplating such efforts as these. It was, for the most part, composed, arranged and published more than two hundred years ago. The state of the world was then very different from what it now is, and the Book has never been so modified as to be adapted to these times, and to contemplate the objects aimed at by the low church party. I supposed that the Prayer Book, however valuable it may have been, or may be now, was adapted to the times of Edward VI., of Elizabeth, and of James I., when it received substantially the form which it now has, and that the efforts which the low church party are now making, in contradistinction from their high church brethren, were not *quite* the same which were sought to be promoted by the Episcopal ministry under those reigns. I specified the following things: that preaching, as contemplated by the Liturgy, is a thing of secondary importance—the main thing designed in the service being prayer and praise; that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is the clear doctrine of the Prayer Book; that there is an obligation on the ministry to present those for con-

firmation who can "say the creed, the Lord's Prayer, the ten commandments, and the parts of the church catechism set forth for that purpose," and that the Prayer Book does not contemplate christian missions, revivals of religion, prayer meetings, sabbath schools, or union with other denominations in promoting the great objects of christian benevolence. These are objects distinctly sought by the low church party, in most of which they are understood to differ from their high church brethren, and I endeavored to show that they are neither contemplated nor fostered by the Prayer Book.

In prosecuting this argument, I had no book before me but the Prayer Book. I wished to look at it uninfluenced by the views of either party in the Episcopal church. I was aware that the low church party were as zealous in commending it to the attention of the world as high churchmen; and I had no reason to believe that those whom I had known were inefficient or inactive members of the "Bishop White Prayer Book Society." It seemed to me to be fair to look at the Book itself, and to enquire whether its circulation would tend to promote the common aims of all evangelical christians.

Sense in which the word "compelled" was used.

I used the word "compelled," when I spoke of the use of the Book by the low church party. On this, the Editors have been pleased to make the following remarks:—

"The absurdity of talking about this *compulsion*, upon those whom he has already declared so earnestly attached to this liturgy that they would rather sacrifice all they have of evangelical truth, than

give it up, is very manifest;—and so also is the equal absurdity of speaking of men as *compelled*, to this or any course, which has been the matter of their own personal, free choice;—and that in many instances, after having had a full experience, of what Mr. Barnes considers the greater freedom and spirituality of Presbyterianism.

"The whole of this statement about compulsory worship as peculiar to them, *is a mere misrepresentation of facts.* The public worship in each instance is fixed. But the Episcopal clergymen have a liberty conceded and secured to them, and universally practised by them, upon all other occasions, of which the Presbyterian minister is perfectly destitute. And no one feeling is more prominent in the minds of those Presbyterians who have come into our ministry, than the new experience which they find of secure and permanent freedom under the dominion of our calm, equal, and just laws."

I used the word "compelled," not as meaning that they are *forced* against their will, or as implying that there is any *restraint* on them whatever, for I have no reason to doubt their honest preference for that mode of worship above all others, and I am not ignorant how sincerely Episcopalians become attached to their forms; but I meant to be understood as saying that *the entire routine of service is prescribed;* that the Prayer Book does not contemplate any deviation from that which is laid down; that the prayers are specified, the selections of Scripture to be read are mentioned, the form of service at baptism, and in the burial of the dead, is all prescribed; and that while the minister who officiates, remains connected with that church, he is expected to use all these forms. I meant to say,

that, on the supposition that a minister in that church should disbelieve the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and should openly and constantly teach the necessity of another kind of new birth, he would be "compelled," in the sense of yielding obedience to his ordination vows, to use that form of baptism which *does* teach the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; that he would not be at liberty to omit it and use another form; and that this is one of the things "which counteracts the effects of their teaching." And is it not so? *Is* a minister of the Episcopal church at liberty to omit the form prescribed for "the private baptism of infants," or the form for "the ministration of baptism to such as are of riper years," and to substitute a form of his own? If so, the permission to do it is not laid down in the Prayer Book. *Is it ever done by a low churchman?* Would he feel himself at "liberty" to omit it? If not, how far was I wrong in using the word "compelled?"

How to understand the latter part of this declaration, that "the Episcopal clergymen have a liberty conceded and secured to them, and universally practised by them, of which the Presbyterian minister is wholly destitute," I wot not. There is but one sense in which it seems possible to understand it, and that is, that they have a liberty of being Calvinists or Armenians, or embracing any intermediate shades of belief, "conceded and secured to them, and universally practised by them," of which "Presbyterians are deprived;" which I understand from Bishop Burnet and others, to be the case. Others differ from Episcopalians about the value of this kind of "liberty" in a church. Of the fact that there is considerable latitude of this kind in the

Episcopal church, we are all well aware; yet precisely where it is "conceded and secured" in the Prayer Book itself, or the canons of the church, does not appear to those who are uninitiated in the mysteries of Episcopacy. As to any greater freedom in the mode of public worship, it cannot be possible that the Editors could have meant that; and what *is* the exact ground of triumph and exultation of those "Presbyterians who have come into our ministry," and the "new experience which they have found of secure and permanent freedom," is not yet revealed to us. I would not misunderstand this passage, and put a gloss on it which the Editors did not intend; but *can* it be true in any other sense than that the Episcopal church, as actually administered, affords very large latitude in doctrinal views to those who minister at her altars; and that they are not encumbered with any such trammels on their liberty, as an enquiry into their views of the doctrines of religion would be?

The question now is, whether, on the points which I specified, the low church party are "compelled to use a liturgy which counteracts the effects of their teaching?"

The doctrine of baptismal regeneration tends to counteract the teachings of the low church party.

I specified, first, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and endeavoured to show that this is the undoubted teaching of the Prayer Book. This was done by a careful examination of the Book itself; and the argument at length, which it would not be proper to repeat here, and which cannot well be condensed, may be seen in my Tract, pp. 35—43.

The answer of the Recorder to this extended argument, is in the words following:

"Upon this subject we do not mean to enter into any long explanation or defence, which Mr. Barnes would undoubtedly shut out from all consideration with the same freedom, and indifference to its truth, that he has done here all explanations which have heretofore been given, as not seeming 'to have the least degree of plausibility.' (p. 35.) That baptismal regeneration in some sense is the doctrine of our church, and of every minister in the church, we do not deny. The Prayer Book undoubtedly teaches it; and the Bible undoubtedly teaches it also. That either or any of these, however, teach it in the sense which Mr. Barnes means to affirm, that is, spiritual regeneration always, without respect to character or qualifications attending baptism, a reference to the language of our 25th Article upon the Sacraments, which declares that '*in such only as worthily receive the same* they have a wholesome effect and operation,—but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith;'—and to the 27th Article on Baptism, which declares that 'baptism is a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, *they that receive baptism rightly*, are grafted into the church;' &c., would have been sufficient to contradict."

In connection with this, and apparently constituting a part of their argument on which much reliance is placed, the Editors appeal to the authority of Dr. Alexander, to the "Liturgy of the Dutch church of the Netherlands," to the "Hymns authorised to be used in public worship by the Presbyterians," to the "Dutch Presbyterian Catechism,"

to the "Saybrook Platform," to "Dr. Moshiem, in behalf of the Lutheran church;" to "Dr. Clarke, a Methodist divine," and to Calvin. Exactly how this teaches us whether the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is, or is not in the Prayer Book, and whether the low churchman is compelled to use a Liturgy which counteracts the effect of his preaching, does not appear. That was the point which I laid down; and from that point it is not my intention to be diverted. I have no doubt that Dr. Alexander is abundantly competent to defend the sentiment which he expressed; and the public will not expect me to be drawn into an *amateur* argument now about the "Liturgy of the Dutch church of the Netherlands," or the "Dutch Presbyterian Catechism," or the "Saybrook Platform." The point is about the ***Liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States of America, and no other.***

There is no attempt to meet the argument which I thought proper to urge; and if my Episcopal friends will "receive it," this is a point on which it becomes them to lay out more strength than has been thought necessary by the Recorder. It is the ***very*** point, above all others, on which Episcopacy fails, and falters, and labors, and is offensive in the view of the community. That community is becoming more and more deeply impressed with the belief that this is the doctrine of the Prayer Book, and more and more firm in the conviction that it is ***not*** the doctrine of the Bible, and that it is a doctrine most dangerous in its tendency. A frank admission of their difficulties on this subject, and the expression of a wish which we know many of them ***have*** cherished, that that feature of the Prayer Book

might be modified by the General Convention, would secure the sympathy of those out of the Episcopal church, and do more than perhaps any thing else, in the present state of things, to satisfy that community that the triumph of evangelism *might* yet be secured in the Episcopal church. Instead of that, in reply to an argument which was framed with care, *and which was drawn directly from the Prayer Book*, we have this meagre response—an avowal of the doctrine, and yet an utter refusal to enter into any "explanation or defence" which would let us know how the doctrine is held.

It is now, however, avowed by the Editors of the Recorder, that baptismal regeneration is "in some sense," a doctrine held by the low church party in common with their high church brethren—and it is a point of much interest and importance to have obtained this avowal. "*That baptismal regeneration in some sense is the doctrine of our church* AND OF EVERY MINISTER IN THE CHURCH, *we do not deny. The Prayer Book undoubtedly teaches it; and the Bible undoubtedly teaches it also.*" From any thing that appears in this argument of the Editors of the Recorder, this doctrine is held in the plain and obvious sense in which it is set forth in the Prayer Book.

The exact "sense" however, in which it is held by the Editors of the Episcopal Recorder, and by the party of which they are the organs, they have not designed to inform us. We have no difficulty in ascertaining in what sense it is believed by the Oxford writers, or by high churchmen generally, but the particular point of interest now is, in what sense it is maintained by the low church party.—The doctrine of baptismal regeneration can be held,

it seems to me, only in one of the following senses. (1.) That "baptism containeth the remission of sins, and hath the *germ* of eternal life," (Dr. Pusey's Sermon before the University of Oxford, p. 5;) that it is "founded on the very notion that the partaking of the incarnation, and the Christian relation of sonship to God is imparted through baptism, and is not imparted without it," (Tracts for the Times, vol. ii. p. 31;) that "the pardon of sins is the direct provision in baptism, and that baptism gives life," (Dr. Pusey's Sermon, p. 6;) that "in baptism the old man is laid aside, the new taken; he entereth a sinner, he ariseth justified," (Tracts, vol. ii. p. 47;) and that "hence we are justified, or both accounted and *made* righteous," (Tracts, vol. ii. p. 24.) This is the doctrine held at Oxford, and which the writers of the "Tracts for the Times" contend with so much zeal and plausibility to be the doctrine of the Prayer Book. See also, the "Churchman," for November 18, 1843. (2.) That the sacrament of baptism produces its effect by an *opus operatum*, or by an efficiency of its own, always securing something of the nature of a *physical* effect on the soul, when properly administered, washing away sin, and rendering the soul pure. This, if I understand it, is the doctrine of the Papists. (3.) That, though the soul is renewed by the direct agency of the Holy Ghost, yet it is, by divine appointment, an agency *always* attending the right administration of the ordinance, and making the subject a member of Christ, and an heir of eternal life, or implanting grace in the soul, which in all cases needs only to be cultivated to secure salvation. (4.) That baptism is of divine appointment, and that the agency of the Holy

Spirit *may* in some cases renew the heart where it is administered. This, if I understand him, is the view of Dr. Alexander, in the passage quoted by the Editors of the Recorder, and I presume would be found to be the doctrine taught in the "Liturgy of the Dutch church of the Netherlands." It may be presumed to be the doctrine held also by Pedobaptists generally, and in fact by all who hold to the doctrine of baptism at all. (5.) That the "regeneration" effected in baptism is not a spiritual renovation, or properly a change of heart, but only a change of state; an introduction into the church, or a mere recognition of the relation to the church in which the child was born, but without supposing that there is necessarily or certainly any agency exerted on the heart by the Holy Ghost. The subject of baptism, according to this view, is to be regarded and treated as sustaining an interesting relation to the church, but as unconverted until he gives evidence of regeneration by the appropriate proofs of piety. Then, and not before, he is to be recognised as a member of the church in the proper sense, and entitled to all its privileges.

Now, as the Editors of the Recorder have not told us in which of these senses "baptismal regeneration is the doctrine of our church and of every minister in the church," there may be some danger of doing injustice to them by attributing any *one* of these opinions to them. That the views of the Tractarians are *not* theirs, we may safely infer from their uniform opposition to Oxfordism. As certainly may we infer that they do not hold to the *opus operatum* of the Papists. In the Prayer Book, however, which, in the sense above explained, they are "compelled" to use, there is *no* ambiguity

in regard to the doctrine there taught. The doctrines of the Prayer Book are these:

(1.) That the change which is wrought at baptism is *by the Holy Ghost.* It is not a mere recognition of a state already existing; it is not that the water of baptism has an intrinsic efficacy to produce the purifying of the heart by an *opus operatum;* it is that *whatever* change then wrought is by the agency of the Holy Spirit. "Dearly beloved, none can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerated, and born anew of water and *of the Holy Ghost.*" "We beseech thee, for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt mercifully look upon this child, wash him, and sanctify him *with the Holy Ghost.*" "Give *thy Holy Spirit* to this infant, that he may be born again, and made an heir of everlasting salvation." "We yield the hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant *with thy Holy Spirit.*" The "ministration for the Private and Public Baptism of Infants, to be used in the church," pp. 143—148. No doctrine could be plainer than that *whatever* change is wrought at baptism, it is by *the Holy Ghost.*

(2.) This is a change, according to the Prayer Book, which *always* occurs when baptism is properly administered. It is not the doctrine as "taught by Dr. Alexander," and as it may be found in "the Liturgy of the Dutch church of the Netherlands," and in the "Dutch Presbyterian catechism," that this change *may* occur, but that it always *does* occur. Dr. Alexander teaches, in the passage quoted by the Recorder, that a child *may* be renewed when the ordinance of baptism is administered, and that parents, "when about to dedicate their children to God in holy baptism, should earnestly pray that

they may be baptised with the Holy Ghost; that while their bodies are washed in the emblematical laver of regeneration, their souls may experience the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus;" the Episcopal Prayer Book teaches that this ALWAYS occurs. There is no mere expression of a belief that it *may* be done. There is no exception made in regard to *any* who are baptised. *In each and every case*, there is precisely the same prayer offered *before* baptism, that God would give his Holy Spirit to the infant, "that he may be born again, and be made an heir of everlasting salvation;" and *in each and every case after baptism*, the same thanks are returned "that it *hath* pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy church." If the directions of the Prayer Book have been attended to, this same form of prayer and thanksgiving has been used in relation to every child that has been baptised since the book was adopted; and has been used, and must be used, by every Episcopal minister in this land, be he a high or a *low* churchman. Whatever the book teaches, then, about the change which it calls "regeneration," it is a change which ALWAYS *occurs*. This is held, I presume, by low churchmen, as well as by their high church brethren. It is impossible *not* to hold it, and maintain a belief in the Prayer Book.

(3.) It is not a mere change of *state* which is implied in this change, according to the Prayer Book. It is not a mere transition from the world to the visible church. It is not a mere profession of religion. It cannot be said, in order to meet the difficulty which low churchman are "compelled" to

meet with, that the word "regeneration" has changed its signification since the book was made; or that they who framed the book meant merely to designate a change of state. There is no evidence of any such change of the meaning of the language which has yet been adduced, and it is apparent on the face of the book itself, that no such change has occurred. The book being the interpreter, there is implied all that is ever implied by the word regeneration in the Bible or in common usage.—This is clear from the following considerations:—(*a*) The very term "*spiritual* regeneration" is used as being that which is prayed for and expected in baptism. "We call upon thee for this Infant, that he, coming to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of sins,* BY SPIRITUAL REGENERATION." What then is the exact meaning of the Editors of the Recorder when they deny that the Prayer Book teaches the "doctrine of baptismal regeneration in the sense which Mr. Barnes means to affirm, that is *spiritual regeneration*"—the *very term* used in the Prayer Book? (*b*) The Prayer Book teaches that every thing which is commonly supposed to denote a change of heart, or a spiritual renovation, is imparted at baptism. It is not a mere change of state, or a transition from the world to the visible church; but the infant is by baptism "made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." *Catechism.* Thanks are returned that he is made "a child of God *by adoption*," and prayer

* How much does this differ from Oxfordism? "Baptism containeth the remission of sins, and hath the *germ* of spiritual life." "The pardon of sins is the direct provision of baptism." "Baptism gives life." *Dr. Pusey.* See "The mysteries opened," by Rev. John S. Stone, D. D. pp. 82, 83.

is offered, not that he *may be converted* afterwards, but that he "*being* dead unto sin, and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in his death, may utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that as *he* is made Partaker of the death of thy Son he may also be Partaker of his Resurrection."* The "Ministration of the private baptism of children." Now these are the very terms which are used in the scriptures, and adopted by the great mass of christians *from* the scriptures, to denote the spiritual change wrought in the heart by the Holy Ghost at the new birth, and neither in the scriptures, nor in the common usages of christians, nor in the systematic writings of theologians, are there any *other* terms which more clearly express the idea.

For reasons such as these, it seems quite clear to those *out* of *the* church, that the Prayer Book has "defined its own position" on this subject with a distinctness which cannot be mistaken, and that the framers of the "incomparable Liturgy" meant to teach that the change effected by baptism is a change produced by the Holy Ghost; is a change which is always effected, and is a change of a spiritual character.—It is remarkable that the Editors of the Recorder should not have attempted to set

*How much does *this* differ from Oxfordism? "This exposition" (that which makes John i. 12, 13, refer to baptism as the instrument of the birth there mentioned,) "is founded on the very notion that *the partaking of the incarnation*, and the christian relation of *sonship to God*, is imparted through baptism." Baptism is "that mystery whereby we *are made partakers of the incarnation*, being baptised into one body, the body of our incarnate Lord." Tracts for the Times, vol. ii. 31. 44.

aside the argument in the Tract under their review by which some of the reasons for this opinion were set forth. The public will probably demand that the views of low churchmen on this vital point should be stated more explicitly, and that it should be shown that the reasoning which seems so obvious about the meaning of the Prayer Book may be set aside.

I by no means charge low churchmen with teaching in their public ministrations, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. I do not believe that they do. I do not deny that the teaching of many, or for aught I know to the contrary, *all* in that party may be as thorough on the subject of the necessity of the new birth, and the agency of the Holy Spirit in producing it, as can be found in other denominations. There is an impropriety in referring in public discussions to living men, and I will, therefore refer only to the dead. A near neighbour, and a frequent hearer, of the late Drs. Bedell and John A. Clark, and long a personal friend of the latter, I esteem it a privilege to bear my testimony to the unshrinking fidelity, the great clearness, the unwavering steadiness of argument, and the fervor of affectionate appeal, with which they urged on their hearers the doctrine of depravity, the danger of the sinner, the impossibility of being saved by any outward works or forms, and the indispensible necessity of being born again. I have no doubt that others in this city and elsewhere evince the same fidelity, and were it proper I would refer to living men here and abroad whose names will be treasured up with the same fond remembrance, and for the same thing, when *they* are removed to heaven. *Serus in coelum redeant.*

None of the difficulties which I have ventured to suggest in regard to Episcopacy, relate to this point. The difficulty pertains to another matter. It is in reference to the consistency of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration as, to use the language of the Recorder, "the Prayer Book undoubtedly teaches it," with this kind of preaching. I presume that low churchmen see some way of explaining this, which others do not. I have not charged one of them with "hypocrisy," as the Recorder alleges.* I have not accused one of them, living or dead, with insincerity. I have certainly no more reason to doubt that they are sincere and honest men, than I have to doubt that I am myself; and I doubt not that they are as conscientiously attached to their own church, as I am to what I esteem—*ab imo pectore*—as a better faith. But if it would *not* be interpreted as charging them with insincerity, I would respectfully ask a conscientious low churchman who believes in the necessity of the new birth, how he can continue to use a form of baptism framed as that is in the Prayer Book? I would ask again, what *must* be the practical effect of the use of that form on his public teaching? Let him not take it unkindly, and let not the community judge it harshly—for it is *fair* to enquire what Episcopacy *is*, and this is just the point in debate—if I ask, how one who believes that by baptism there is

* "For the clergy themselves, we need say nothing. Mr. Barnes *has in so many other instances in this book proclaimed their* ABSOLUTE HYPOCRISY, that this additional instance with which he charges them, of consenting to use a Liturgy which is directly opposed to all their preaching, and yet professing to love and admire it at the same time, can hardly make their case worse in his representation."

not, as the Recorder teaches, "spiritual regeneration always;" who teaches that there is a necessity of a renovation of heart by the Holy Ghost, and that no certain dependence can be placed on baptism however administered to secure this, can, on the same day, and on all occasions when an infant is baptised, use this language; "WE YIELD THEE HEARTY THANKS, MOST MERCIFUL FATHER, THAT IT HATH PLEASED THEE TO REGENERATE THIS INFANT WITH THY HOLY SPIRIT?" Another question here. The Recorder teaches us, on the subject of confirmation, that "the universal practice of the church is, to leave in the hands of the minister of the parish, the *sole* power of judgment of the characters of the persons to be confirmed," and so far as I can understand the Editors, they claim that the minister of the parish is at liberty *not* to present a candidate, even though he has been taught to "say the creed, the Lord's prayer, the ten commandments, and such parts of the church catechism as are set forth for that purpose," and that he has a right to insist on the evidence of a renovated heart as a qualification. The low churchman would demand, I presume, substantially the same evidence which would be required by a Presbyterian, a Baptist, or a Methodist. He would require evidence of a "spiritual regeneration;" that is, something different from what is implied in "baptismal regeneration" as he understands it; something which is not necessarily secured by baptism. He goes through a long course of counsel to prepare the candidate for confirmation, with this view. The nature of regeneration as a distinct thing from baptism is set forth, and the usual evidences of piety are insisted on. Having done this,

as a part of the preparation for confirmation, (See "the form for the baptism of children,") it is necessary still to ascertain whether he can "*say* the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, and is sufficiently instructed in the other parts of the church Catechism set forth for that purpose." *In* that church Catechism, the following questions and answers occur. "*Question.*—What is your name? *Answer.*—N., or M. *Question.*—Who gave you this name? *Answer.*—My sponsors in baptism, *wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.*" I charge no low churchman, I repeat, with hypocrisy. I believe they have some way of explaining this which I do not understand. But *is* the question an unfair one to ask how *can* a man teach this, who does *not* believe that in any proper sense, baptism confers "spiritual regeneration," and all the tendency of whose preaching and teaching has been, that something more is necessary in order to be "regenerated by the Holy Ghost," to "be made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven?" There *may* be a way in which all these things may be wholly consistent, but that way has not yet been explained. To the Editors of the Recorder it may be a matter of little importance to tell a Presbyterian *how*.

The requirements in regard to Confirmation counteract the teaching of the low church party.

I specified, as a second difficulty in reference to the efforts of the Evangelical party, the prescriptions of the Prayer Book respecting confirmation, and endeavored to demonstrate from that book, that

it contemplated that a child which had been properly baptised, shall be "brought to the bishop to be confirmed by him so soon as he can say the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, and is sufficiently instructed in the other parts of the church catechism for that purpose." The argument which I instituted was designed to show that, according to the Prayer Book, it is supposed that the child is "regenerated by the Holy Ghost," is "made a child of God," and is "incorporated into the holy church" by baptism; that grace is always implanted in connection with that ordinance, and that if that grace is properly cultivated, he is to be brought, at the proper age, to the bishop to take upon himself the vows made by his "sponsors" at baptism. I endeavored to show that this is a consequent of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, or is *in the line* of the arrangements by which it is supposed in the Prayer Book that the child is to be saved. I am confirmed in this view by the statement made by the Rt. Rev. Alex. V. Griswold, D. D., the late venerable prelate of the Episcopal church in New England, (Sermons, 1830,) and by the Treatise, "What is Christianity, by Thomas Vowler Short, Bishop of Sodor and Man," men who would be regarded by the low church party as proper expounders of the meaning of the Liturgy. I referred, in proof of the position which I laid down, to a train of reasoning from a similar case, pursued by the Rev. Dr. Tyng, in reference to the ordination of Mr. Carey, showing that the Bishop was bound by something of the nature of a compact to ordain one who had complied with all the outward requisitions of the canons. This reasoning of Dr. Tyng seemed to me to prove

with equal clearness, that the "minister of the parish" is bound to present for confirmation those who have complied with the direction to be able to say the creed, &c. I admitted that the low church party do in fact pursue a different course, and that they demand evidence of conversion in order to confirmation, as really as the evangelical ministers of other denominations require such evidence in order to an admission to the privileges of the Lord's supper, and I said also, "we are willing to admit that there must be some discretion allowed to the officiating minister or rector of a parish in regard to those who are to be presented, for the fair rules of interpretation seem to demand that he shall not be required to present those who are open infidels, or who are grossly immoral." pp. 44, 45.

The Editors have not thought it of importance to notice my reasoning from the Prayer Book, from the argument of Dr. Tyng, or the admission which I made in regard to the discretionary power of the "minister of the parish," and I shall, therefore, allow the reasoning which I offered in the case to pass for what it is worth. If it had any strength when I urged it, it has the same now, and whatever may be the *practice* in the Episcopal church, it may serve somewhat to show what the theory is as it is laid down in the Prayer Book.

The only reply of the Editors is in the following words: "We would respectfully refer him to the rubric in the Prayer Book, which he professes to have read, at the end of the Catechism, which says, 'whenever the Bishop shall give knowledge for children to be brought unto him for their confirmation, the minister of every parish, shall either bring or send in writing with his hand subscribed there-

unto, the names of all such persons within his parish, *as he shall think fit to be presented to the Bishop to be confirmed.*' We would also refer him to Canon 26, which enacts, 'It shall be the duty of ministers to prepare young persons and others for the Holy Ordinance of Confirmation. And *he shall be ready to present for confirmation such persons as he shall think properly qualified;* and shall deliver to the Bishop a list of the names of those confirmed.' Under these laws the universal practice of the Church, is to leave in the hands of the minister of the parish, the *sole* power of judgment of the character of persons to be confirmed, or to be admitted to the Lord's Table. No Bishop in the Church would attempt the confirmation of an individual, thus judged and rejected by pastoral authority, unless manifest and extreme injustice had been done. And how could this right or responsibility in other pastors, be more accurately defined or secured?"

On the argument which I constructed on this subject, which was presented in no unkind spirit or words, and which could have been easily met if it were unsound, the Editors are pleased to indulge themselves in the following singular remarks:—

"With what honesty then can Mr. Barnes occupy *eleven pages* of his book, *in the deliberate framing of a contrary statement*, when a simple reference to our known laws would have exhibited to him the truth at once? *There is here exhibited just as there is through the whole book, the determination to vilify and destroy, not the party avowedly the object, but the Church to which they belong.* There is no 'inquiry' into facts, from one end of

the publication to the other, but a succession of *unfounded assertions, and imputations equally destitute of truth and proof.*"

To this, of course, I shall not be expected to reply. The *argument* of the Editors in the case is, "that the minister of the parish shall present such persons *as he shall think fit to be presented to the Bishop to be confirmed.*" "*He shall be ready to present for confirmation such persons as he shall think properly qualified.*" The question then is, what is the "fitness" which the minister of the parish, according to the Prayer Book, is allowed to require? What is the limit of the "proper qualifications" for that rite? It is not what is proper according to the New Testament; or what the minister himself might judge; but what is it according to the published standards of the Episcopal church, what did the framers of the Prayer Book contemplate? Is the minister of the parish to be allowed absolute discretion in the case? Has the candidate no rights, as is contended by Dr. Tyng respecting the candidate for ordination? Is the minister of the parish at liberty to adopt any thing which he may choose as constituting the "*fitness*" for confirmation? Suppose he were to be a "Calvinist of the highest order," and were to insist, as a necessary qualification, that the candidate should assent to all the articles of that faith. Suppose he were to embrace some fanatical views of conversion of the wildest kind, and should insist that those constituted the "fitness" for confirmation. Suppose he were to insist on his joining a temperance society, or his expressing his abhorrence of slavery; would these be proper things for him to demand as qualifications for confirmation? Suppose it should

happen to occur to him to demand assent to all the articles of belief contained in the "Liturgy of the Dutch church of the Netherlands," would he have a right to require this?—Why not, just as much as to insist on compliance with his own views of regeneration, if those views were not what is laid down in the Prayer Book? Where will he find in that book that he has a right to demand the one more than the other? Probably most persons would answer these questions in one way, and by precisely the same rule. It would be by turning at once to the Prayer Book, and by asking whether these things are laid down as constituting the "fitness" for the rite, and by ascertaining whether "discretion," *is* given to the "minister of the parish" to make these the conditions of confirmation.

The low church minister claims that he has the right to withhold one from confirmation who does not give *him* satisfactory evidence that he is converted according to *his* views of conversion. This being his own rule of judging of what is piety in the case, in the exercise of the "liberty which Episcopal clergymen have conceded and secured to them," he claims the right to withhold any one, and every one under his ministry, from confirmation, who does not give *him* evidence that he has experienced something more than is understood by his high church brethren to be secured by baptismal regeneration. In this he is undoubtedly right so far as the New Testament is concerned, but is this Episcopacy as it is in the Prayer Book? Has *he* any more right to insist on this, in opposition to the views and practices of his high church brethren, than he would have to demand assent to the higher articles of Calvanism, or to a subscription to a temperance pledge?

The answer to all this seems still to be plain. We turn at once to the Prayer Book, and there is nothing of it there. No such liberty is conceded to him, and as far as the uninitiated can understand language, it is not contemplated by the Prayer Book. The successive steps in the process, according to the Prayer Book are these :—

1. The unconscious child, through his sponsors, by what in the legal profession would be called a fiction of law, " renounces the devil and his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same ;" professes to " believe all the articles of the christian faith as contained in the apostles creed," promises " obediently to keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of his life." This is a promise supposed to be made *by* the child *as if* then a moral agent and a believer in the truth of religion.

2. On the ground of this faith the infant is baptised, and is made " regenerate by the Holy Ghost, and a member of Christ, the child of God, an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, and is incorporated into the holy church."

3. The sponsors, not the parents, are to " take care that this child be brought to the bishop to be confirmed by him, so soon as he can say the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, and is sufficiently instructed in the other parts of the church catechism set forth for that purpose." This is all the counsel which *they* receive as to the " fitness" or " qualifications" for confirmation.

4. At a suitable time, the child is brought to the Bishop, presented by the " minister of the parish," to take upon himself the vows which were made in his name at baptism, and then the sponsors are

supposed to be released. "Then shall the Bishop say, Do ye here in the presence of God, and of this congregation, *renew* the solemn promise and vow that *ye* made, or that was made in your name at your baptism, ratifying and confirming the same; and acknowledging yourselves bound to believe and do all those things which *ye* then undertook, or which your sponsors then undertook for you? *And every one shall audibly answer, I do.*" Here is no new thing; no profession of any change of heart; of having undergone any spiritual change since the baptism, nor is any evidence *required* of a new birth further than was supposed to occur at baptism. All that is done is to *confirm* and *ratify* what, by an unauthorized fiction, the child was understood then to believe and to profess, and the *delay* has been, not that he might be converted, but that he might be "instructed," and might come to suitable age to take these vows upon himself.

5. In all this, there is no discretion allowed by the Prayer Book to the "minister of the parish" to interpose any thing new. There is no "freedom conceded and secured" by the book, whatever there may be in practice, to insist on any new test or qualification, or any evidence of "conversion" according to the peculiar views which he may have.

If this view of the *process* by which one born in the Episcopal church is to be "confirmed" is erroneous, it would be very easy to show it. I admit that this is not the course pursued by the low church party. I admit that, in general, they demand evidence of conversion as really as any Presbyterian or Methodist would—and herein lies my argument, that their practice is not sanctioned by

the Prayer Book, and is not, on fair rules of interpreting language, what that book contemplated.

The Burial Service counteracts the teaching of the Evangelical party.

These were the points to which I referred in my Tract as counteracting the efforts of low churchmen in the necessary use of the Prayer Book. To these I now add, in order to a complete statement of the entire effect of the system in the Prayer Book, the necessity of using the service appointed for the burial of the dead. I am not insensible to the beauty of that service, nor to its general appropriateness, for the burial of true Christians. It is only as a part of a system; as connected with the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and as identified with the views of confirmation laid down in the Liturgy, that it is proper here to examine it. The argument is, simply, that if it be the doctrine of the Prayer Book, that those who are baptised are regenerated by the Holy Ghost, and are to be confirmed in the manner laid down, and it be true that, according to the Prayer Book, those who are thus baptised and who do not lead scandalous lives, are to be buried with the assured prospect of a glorious resurrection, it is a constant influence operating in the church to counteract the effects of the teaching of the Evangelical party. It tends to beget and cherish false hopes; to perpetuate views of the nature of religion abhorrent alike to the New Testament and to the teachings of the Evangelical party. In regard to this service, which is so much praised, and in the main so deservedly admired and valued by Episcopalians, I would observe,

(1.) That the low church party, in common with high churchmen, are "compelled" to use it on all occasions except the three which will be soon specified. Thus the direction in the rubric is as positive respecting this, as it is in respect to the other services required in the Prayer Book. No "discretion" is allowed as to its omission, or the omission of any part of it, except in the choice between two short prayers at the close of the service, in which there is no ground for preference as to the point now before us. Thus it is directed, "The minister meeting the corpse at the entrance of the church yard, *shall* say, or sing;" "After they are come into the church, *shall* be said or sung the following anthem:" "Then *shall* follow the lesson;" "Then, while the earth shall be cast upon the body by some standing by, the minister SHALL say." It is also true, as far as I have any knowledge, that the low churchman never has any reluctance to use this whole form at funerals.

(2.) The service is framed on the supposition of the salvation of all those over whom it is to be read. This is evident because, (*a*) those only are excluded from it of whom there can be no reasonable hope of salvation; the "unbaptised, those who die excommunicate, and those who have laid violent hands on themselves;" and, (*b*) the expressions which are to be used on the occasion are such as obviously and naturally imply this belief, and, indeed, are so couched as to leave no doubt that such is the meaning. Thus in every case, it is said that the "minister," while "the earth shall be cast upon the body," "SHALL *say*," "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God, in his wise Providence, to take out of this world the soul of our de-

ceased brother, we therefore commit his body to the ground; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; *looking for the general resurrection in the last day, and the life of the world to come, through our Lord Jesus Christ.*" Then immediately "shall be said or sung" "I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, from henceforth blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." (*c*) That this is the true interpretation is apparent, because it is forbidden to read this service over the unbaptised, the excommunicated, and suicides. If the expressions here used were of a general character, and were designed only to speak of the resurrection in general, and of the hope of the life to come, without any reference to the one who is buried, it would be as proper to use them at the funeral of an unbaptised person, or a suicide, as any other person. It is only because they are supposed to be appropriate to the individual, and they are directed in his case to be used, and are forbidden in the case of others.

(3.) The effect of this service is to lead all to suppose that *if* they are baptised, and are not excommunicated, and do not commit suicide, they are safe. They may then have this service appropriately read over their graves, and lie down in the hope of heaven. They have been "regenerated by the Holy Ghost" at baptism; they have never been "excommunicated" from the true church; and they have committed no such crime as to exclude from the hope of heaven; and they will be permitted to sleep in consecrated ground. They are grouped with those who are to be saved, and having been baptised, confirmed, and kept in the church, and appropriately buried, they are now united with others "looking for the life of the world to come."

(4.) It is worthy of remark, who are grouped together as unworthy of christian burial, and the reason why they are so. This service is not to be used for any *unbaptised* person, nor for the *excommunicated*, nor for *suicides*. These three crimes or offences are grouped together as being, in the matter under consideration, on a level; equally excluding from the hope of heaven, and from the privileges of christian burial; and they are the *only* offences that are regarded as of sufficient importance to exclude from such a burial. The "unbaptised" and suicides are to lie side by side, without the limits of a christian burial-place; and over neither the one nor the other is the minister of the Lord Jesus, if he has been Episcopally ordained, to perform any religious service whatever, according to the Prayer Book. The only *reason* for this must be that this service considers all whom it consigns to the grave, as regenerate persons; and that according to its judgment, the unbaptised person is as certainly unregenerate as the excommunicated, or the suicide. "No matter of what crimes a man may have been guilty, if he has not committed suicide, if he has not been excommuuicated, if he has been only *Episcopally baptised;* though he may have lived a drunkard's life, and may fill a drunkard's grave; though he may have wronged t e widow and the fatherless; though he may have plotted treason, and imbrued his hands in blood, still he is thus to be buried, 'looking for the life of the world to come,'"* because in infancy he was baptised, and has neither been excommunicated, nor laid violent hands on himself. Nor does it appear that the minister has any discretionary

* New Englander, vol. ii. p. 277.

power in extreme cases. The corpse may be that of a professed Atheist, or of as profane and profligate a man as ever died without repentance; still, if the baptism of the deceased be recorded, and there is no record of excommunication, the "minister, meeting the corpse at the entrance of the churchyard, and going before it either into the church, or towards the grave, SHALL say or sing" the burial service, as if he were a Baxter or a Leighton.*

(5.) The practical operation of this service must be to "counteract the effect of the teaching" of the low church party. It is an appropriate sequel of

* The exact practical effect of this ordinance will be better understood, if it be remembered that, according to one of the most able historians of the Episcopal church in this country, and one of its most eminent divines, there is no power of "excommunication" now residing in the church. I refer to the authority of the Rev. Dr. Hawks. Thus he says:—

"Who ever heard of the excommunication of a layman by our branch of the Apostolic church? Neither the General Convention, nor any State Convention, have ever provided any 'rules or process' for excommunication. There is not a clergyman in the church, who, if he were desirous to excommunicate an offender, would know how to take the very first step in the process. It certainly is not to be done according to his mere whim; and if it were so done, it is as certainly invalid. Shall then the Presbyter alone do it, or shall it be done by his Bishop, or by a conclave of Bishops, or of Bishops and Presbyters, or by a State Convention including the laity, or by the General Convention including the laity again? No man can answer it, for there is no rule on the subject." "There are very few of the dioceses in which *any* provision is made by canon for investigating or trying the case of a *layman*."—Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States, pp. 359, 360. 362. The practical effect of the rule then must be, that only the "unbaptised," and those "who lay violent hands on themselves," are excluded from the privilege of christian burial in the Protestant Episcopal church.

the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and of the rules for confirmation; and, despite all the teaching to the contrary, it is '*a constant* force' operating to keep up the impression that they who are thus baptised and honorably buried, who have neither been excommunicated, and who are not self-murderers, are safe. This effect is candidly admitted by Archbishop Whately, a man, who, from his rank, talents, and candor, has by his concessions, given more trouble to "churchmen" than all those who, out of the limits of "*the* church" have presumed to examine its institutions. Thus he says, "I have known a person, in speaking of a deceased neighbor, whose character had been irreligious and profligate, remark, how great a comfort it was to hear the words of the funeral service read over her, 'because, poor woman, she had been such a bad liver.' I have heard of an instance again of a superstition, probably before unsuspected, being accidentally brought to light, by the minister's having forbidden a particular corpse to be brought into the church, because the person had never frequented it when alive; the consequence of which was, that many old people began immediately to frequent the church, who had before been in the habit of absenting themselves."—Essays on Romanism, ch. i. § 9. v. As a simple but very important question, it might be asked of every conscientious low churchman, whether he never feels any difficulty or any doubt about the propriety of reading this whole service over those over whom by the rubric he is required to "say or sing" it?

In my Tract, having shown that there were things in the Prayer Book which low churchmen as well as the high churchmen were required to

use, the tendency of which was to "counteract the effect of their teaching," I proceeded to a third general consideration, which was, that there "are no arrangements or provisions in the Liturgy for promoting their peculiar and distinctive efforts, or which contemplate such efforts."

THE THIRD GENERAL POSITION IN THE ARGUMENT:

Missions.

The first thing which I specified in which there are no arrangements or provisions in the Liturgy for promoting the peculiar and distinctive efforts of the low church party, was that Christian missions to the heathen are not contemplated by the Prayer Book, pp. 50, 51. The argument was, that the use of the Liturgy is unfavorable to the work of missions—requiring responses, and changes of posture and of vestments, and is adapted rather to an already organized congregation than to the work of collecting such a congregation from among the heathen; that there are no references to such efforts in the Prayer Book, no prayers for the success of missions, no allusions to churches gathered among the heathen, and no petitions that the missionary in heathen lands may be sustained in his trials, and encouraged in his work. I then went into an extensive examination of the prayers and collects appointed to be used, and found in all the Prayer Book, besides the incessant repeating of the Lord's prayer, but one single petition to be offered in the ordinary public service of this kind, to wit, "We humbly beseech thee for all sorts and conditions of men, that thou wouldst be pleased to make thy ways known unto them, thy saving health unto all nations." Besides this, there is in the

Prayer Book, a solitary petition, to be used *once in a year*, that God would "have mercy upon all Jews, Turks, infidels, and heretics." This comprehensive petition, to be offered in the Episcopal churches, not on the Sabbath, but on "Good Friday," is the solitary prayer which the Fathers of the Episcopal church have thought it of importance to have offered that the Saviour's last command may be carried into effect by *the* church. To this argument, the Editors have been pleased to furnish the following brief reply:

"Upon the character of the Prayer Book itself in this relation, it is hardly necessary for us to speak. Episcopalians are perfectly informed, that they can never meet in worship according to their Liturgy, without uniting in many prayers for the universal extension of the Gospel throughout the world. And perhaps there is no feature in the Prayer Book more distinct and evident than the very great proportion of its intercessory language, and especially for spiritual benefits to mankind."

How easy and how courteous it would have been for them to have referred to some at least of those "*many* prayers for the universal extension of the Gospel throughout the world," which Episcopalians are so "perfectly informed" are found in their "Liturgy." If there are such prayers, they are not apparent to non-episcopal eyes.—The Editors then make the following remarks on the *general subject* of Episcopal missions:—

"The whole testimony of facts as they are before the view of the Christian world, are directly against him. What are all the missions of the Moravian Churches, but a complete and thorough testimony to the adaptation of Episcopacy and a

Liturgy to the extension of the Gospel among the heathen? And as Mr. Barnes' whole argument is founded upon the abstract principles of Episcopacy and a Form of Prayer, they constitute just as complete a reply as any facts in our own church particularly. But we will not rest upon these. Does not Mr. Barnes know that the Church of England was engaged in missions to the heathen more than one hundred years before the Church of Scotland started in the work? The Society for promoting Christian knowledge was established in 1690. The Scottish Missionary Society in 1796. Is Mr. Barnes ignorant that the most successful of all modern missions have thus far been under Episcopal ministrations? Does he know nothing of the eminent spread of the Gospel in the last century in the Peninsula and islands of Southern India under the Christian Knowledge Society of the Church of England? In the year 1750 the converts from heathenism in the single station of Tranquebar alone amounted to eight thousand. The Society for propagating the Gospel in foreign parts was formed in 1701, and its labors were successfully directed to the Indians of North America. The Church Missionary Society which was established in 1801, has been perhaps the most successful instrument of establishing the Gospel among the heathen of all in modern efforts. Does Mr. Barnes know nothing of Africa, of Regentstown; of India, of Chunar, and Krishnaghur? Has he no knowledge of Buchanan, of Martyn, of Heber, of Johnson, of Bowley, of Wilson? Have his own people never been roused or melted by the sweet hymn of one of these despised Episcopalians. How could a man who holds his station in the community, and has his opportu-

nities of information, so blind himself with prejudice, as to say, p. 54, in the face of an army of facts like these which were familiar to the least informed of modern Christians, that, '*a missionary society or missionary effort, whether in connection with other Christians, or by themselves, is a thing unknown to the constitution of the Episcopal Church ?*'"

To the general truth of these statements respecting the missions of Episcopalians, I have no disposition to reply. I would not detract in the least degree from any claim which they may derive from self-denying efforts, to the gratitude of mankind. Some of the names here referred to are embalmed in the affectionate remembrance of mankind, and will be loved and honored as long as piety and holy zeal are respected among men. There has been no conqueror at whose grave I should feel so deep emotions as at the grave of Martyn, and perhaps no man has lived since the time of Paul who has earned for himself a brighter or more imperishable crown.—I might doubt, indeed, if this statement were examined with carefulness, whether the "most successful of all modern missions, thus far, have been under Episcopal ministrations." I might ask for the precise specifications to show where Episcopal missions have been more "successful" than the missions of the American Board in the Sandwich Islands, or in Ceylon, of the Baptist in Burmah, or of the London Missionary Society in the South Sea Islands. I might ask whether these very "successful missions" under "Episcopal ministrations" refer to those which have been conducted by the "Protestant Episcopal church" or to the "Moravians," and whether, therefore, they prove any thing in

reference to the tendency of the Prayer Book to foster and sustain missions? And perhaps I might ask, without impropriety, how it happens that in this enumeration the reference is solely to missions conducted by those across the waters, and not to the Episcopal church in the United States? But all this would be aside from my argument, from which I do not intend to be diverted.*

The question is, what has all this to do with the position which I laid down? How does it prove that "missions to the heathen are contemplated by the Prayer Book?" How does it demonstrate that "a Missionary Society, or a missionary effort, whether in connection with other christians, or by themselves, *is* a thing contemplated by the *constitution* of the Episcopal church?" How does it prove that there *are* references to such efforts in the Prayer Book; that there *are* prayers for the suc-

* The *spirit* and *aims* with which Episcopal missions are conducted, and the entire unwillingness of Episcopalians to be understood as co-operating with other denominations, may be understood from the following extract from the Report of the Medical Missionary Society of China. Macao, 1843. The Rev. P. Parker, M. D., in his report of his efforts made during his visit to America, England, and France, at page 33, says, "It was indeed my special aim, during great part of my visit in London, to secure, in the first instance, the interests and patronage of that class (nobility and Bishops) which may readily be induced to lead in a good cause, but will hardly be willing to follow. An objection however, exists, in the separation of the established Church of England from those not included within its pale, which it was found difficult to obviate, and indeed the bishop of London very frankly, yet with much courtesy, remarked that 'much as he approved of the object, and the means used to attain it, he could not in any way co-operate in such labors with those who dissent from the established church.'"

cess of missions; that there *are* allusions to churches gathered among the heathen; and that there *are* petitions that the missionary in heathen lands may be sustained in his toils, and encouraged in his work? How does all this prove that the Liturgy accords with the spirit of this age, or with the aims of the Evangelical party? I will ask one other question here, whatever interpretation may be put upon it. *Does* the Prayer Book, in this respect, meet the aspirations and desires of the truly pious members of the Episcopal church, in regard to missions? *Do* they find there all that they wish to express before the altars of their God and Saviour, in reference to the salvation of the world? *Have* they no other wishes for the success of the gospel among the heathen, than those which find a response in the service appointed in the Liturgy? Do they never offer proportionably more frequent, more fervent, and more prolonged prayers for these great objects in their closets, and in prayer meetings, than they find there? And if there *were* more frequent petitions of this kind in the Liturgy, would they not meet a want of their souls which is now sadly felt by multitudes in the Episcopal churches?

I find no fault here with the Liturgy itself, and cast no blame on its framers. It is, in this respect, such as was adapted to the age in which it was framed; and is such as Calvin, and Beza, and Melancthon, and Knox, and Bucer would have made, but it is not adapted to *this* age. Those men were engaged in another work to which God then called them, besides sending missions to the heathen; and they did their work well. But why should their plans and aims be supposed to be all that would be

required in another age, and when God calls his churches to another work? How could *any* "petrified wisdom" of that age, whether at Geneva, at Canterbury, or in Edinburgh, be precisely what would be needed when the church and the world had moved on some three hundred years? The Editors of the Recorder have made a frank confession in relation to another point, which I have been greatly surprised was not as frankly made on this. It is found under No. 14 of their specifications of "inconsistencies and contradictions" in my Tract. They say of the Liturgy, "The blessed martyrs and divines who compiled it were not gifted with prophecy." The remark is applied by them to show that they could not have "conceived in advance, the multiplied and multiform sects into which the then nascent Presbyterianism was to rend and divide the professed body of Christ." How obvious, and how kind to their memory it would have been, to have conceded that they could not foresee the glorious efforts which would be called forth in the nineteenth century, to spread the gospel around the world; and that, therefore, it might be "expedient," as Bishop Griswold has said on another subject, so to alter the book as to adapt it to this age? Can any one believe that if Matthew Parker, Richard Cox, Dr. May, Dr. Bill, James Pilkington, Thomas Smith, David Whitehead, and Edmund Grindell, who were appointed by Elizabeth to revise king Edward's Liturgies, lived in these times, and partook of the spirit of the low church party in this country, there would have been as few references to missionary operations, and as entire a want of any arrangement for missions among the heathen, as we now find in that book?

The sum of my remarks on this part of the Prayer Book is, that the references to the spread of the gospel, in the devotional parts of the book, are not such as the piety of this age should breathe forth for the salvation of the world.

Revivals of Religion are not contemplated by the Prayer Book.

I specified as a second thing in which there are "no arrangements or provisions in the Liturgy for promoting their peculiar and distinctive efforts," that revivals of religion are not contemplated by the Prayer Book. p. 54. I assumed that the low church party are, in general, friendly to what are commonly called "revivals of religion," though I know not that they would prefer to use that term. To the thing itself, referring to the extraordinary influences of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of souls, when many under the means of grace are called simultaneously or in a brief period into the kingdom of Christ, I believed them, as I still believe them, to be friendly. I had known not a few of them who labored with a zeal and fidelity for so glorious an effect of the gospel, quite equal to any who are connected with other denominations, and I doubt not that their zeal is as pure. But the question is, whether the peculiar efforts which are necessary in such a work are contemplated by the Prayer Book; whether the use of that Book is well adapted to such a scene; whether the framers of the Liturgy contemplated such scenes or had them in their eye; and whether in the regular use of that Book, with no other method of devotion, such scenes would be likely to occur. With this view, I examined the Book, and endeavored to show that

there is nothing there which is adapted to the thrilling scenes of such a work of grace. I found no prayers that careless sinners may be awakened, and that inquirers may be guided to Christ, which would express the warm feelings of a church at such a time. I supposed, also, that it was a common practice for low churchmen at such times to have "prayer meetings," where extemporary prayers are offered, and to adopt other measures such as have been found useful among other Christians, which are not specified in the Prayer Book, and the natural interpretation put on these facts *out* of "the church" is, that they are resorted to because the arrangements in the Prayer Book are not *all* which are demanded to promote revivals of religion. The interpretation which, I believe, is put upon these facts by the high church party is, that the peculiar efforts of the low church party in promoting revivals are not contemplated by the Liturgy, and that they are striving to imitate other denominations rather than to carry out the objects contemplated by "the church." In this interpretation, it seemed to me, the high church were undoubtedly right.

In reply to the reasoning which I pursued on this point, the Editors of the Recorder, make the following remarks:

"In reply to such *perfectly unfounded statements*, we hardly know what to say,—the charge seems so VOLUNTARILY UNTRUE from a man who professes to have examined this book. We should feel compelled to say, that the excellencies of the Prayer Book were in the very facts which Mr. Barnes denies. It is filled with the very petitions which he asserts are not to be found there. He elsewhere

says, p. 33, of the 'extemporary prayers' of Episcopalians which he has heard, that 'their prayers are models of a simple, pure, and holy worship.' They may well be so, for they are uniformly framed of the very expressions, and conveyed in the very ideas which have been acquired from the Liturgy. As for the adaptation of this Liturgy to revivals of religion, we have seen it used day after day, for weeks and months, in just such works of grace, and every day the interest in it became deeper, and the love of it the more intense. The peculiar application of it to such awakened feeling is very remarkable. The single prayer of the Litany, 'O Lamb of God, who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us, grant us thy peace,' seems in itself to outweigh in worth, all the formal, theoretical, discursive prayers, we have ever heard from Presbyterians."

They then refer to works of grace which have occurred in this city, and ask, "in what congregations has religion flourished more" than in those where the Liturgy is used? "Where have larger additions been annually made to the Lord's flock?" To all that can be said on the point on which these questions bear, I accord my humble testimony that it is true, and I shall go into no comparison in this respect, between the Evangelical Episcopal churches and those of other denominations. I trust I shall ever rejoice in all the success with which God shall ever crown the preaching of the gospel, by whomsoever dispensed. But the point before us is, what is the relation between such works of grace as are called "revivals of religion" and the Prayer Book? On this point, a few questions will embrace all I desire to say.

(1.) Is such a thing as a "prayer meeting" contemplated at all in the Prayer Book? Is there *any* service contemplated except what is to occur on the Sabbath, or on a saints' day, or some other of the holy days? Is there such a thing referred to as a voluntary meeting together of Christians, with or without a clergyman, when the service of the church is not to be used? If there is, it would be easy to specify the place. I have not been so happy as to find it, and have not been referred to it by the Editors of the Recorder. I believe high church Episcopalians who, it seems to me, are quite as thorough students of the Prayer Book as their brethren, with great uniformity, deny that any such meetings are designed by the book.

(2.) Do those who attend prayer meetings in the low church party, never introduce anything which is not in the Prayer Book? Do they pray for no other objects than are there specified, or use no other language than that which is written down? If they do, what is the authority for it in the Prayer Book? That they do, is certainly the impression of those non-episcopalians who occasionally attend those meetings, notwithstanding the Editors say so positively that these "extemporary" prayers are "*uniformly* framed of the very expressions, and conveyed in the very ideas which have been acquired from the Liturgy."

(3.) Would the Prayer Book be all that is needed or proper in a revival of religion? Would its exclusive use be the best thing to promote such a work of grace? Are the prayers such as a minister of the gospel instinctively wishes to offer in such a time for those who are enquiring the way to life, for the awakening, and conviction, and conversion

of sinners? If so, why is it not always used? Why do low churchman ever resort to extemporary prayers?

(4.) Were revivals of religion, as the term is now used, in fact contemplated by the framers of the Liturgy? Nothing can be plainer than that they were not. Revivals of religion, as the term is now used, were not known in that time. There are features about such works of grace, as they occur in this land and in this age, which were unknown in England in the days of Edward VI., of Elizabeth, and of James I. The framers of the Liturgy were, doubtless, good and wise men; but it cannot be supposed that they could foresee all the phases which religion would assume in the course of two or three hundred years; and whatever might have been *their* aims, and however much they may have desired the promotion of religion, it cannot be pretended that they were acquainted with revivals, as they have occurred in this age, or that they formed the Liturgy with reference to such works of grace. The high church party, it is believed, in their interpretation of the Prayer Book, find no allusion to such phenomena, and would maintain, I presume, quite as stoutly as I have done, that there is no such reference in the book.

(5.) The Editors of the Recorder, in commenting on my remarks on revivals of religion, and speaking of what they have witnessed in the Episcopal churches in "twenty-five years," say, "These things are known; they have been uniformly and always the legitimate fruits of this very Liturgy." But how has it happened that these "legitimate fruits of the Liturgy" never spring up under the auspices of the high church party? Are they less

assiduous and faithful in the use of this Liturgy than the low church party? Do they make a less exclusive employment of it in the public service than their low church brethren? The common impression in this city, I presume, have been, that the "revivals" of religion in the Episcopal churches, under the care of low churchmen, has been *somehow* specially connected with the kind of *preaching* with which the church of St. Andrew's and kindred churches have been favored, and that the effects there witnessed have *not* "always" been merely "the legitimate fruits of this very Liturgy." It will be somewhat difficult for the public to understand how "this very Liturgy" has produced such different effects on the two classes of churches. "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter? Can the fig-tree bear olive berries? Either a vine, figs? So can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh."

There are no Arrangements in the Prayer Book for the promotion of Sunday Schools, or for the proper religious training of the young.

I specified as a third thing in which there were no arrangements in the Liturgy for promoting the peculiar objects aimed at by the Evangelical party, that there are no provisions for the promotion of religion among the young in Sunday Schools, whether as a sectarian matter, or in connection with other denominations. In reference to this, I observed, that the Sabbath School is an institution which has grown up since the Prayer Book was arranged for the use of the Anglican church, and that it has never been modified so as to meet these peculiar efforts for the young. I quoted Archbishop

Whately, who admits and laments this defect in the system, and who candidly confesses that a revision of the Prayer Book, so as to adapt it it to the efforts to train up the young, would be no small improvement. I had reason to suppose that all low churchmen would admit the same thing without hesitation. I knew of their zeal in so good a cause, and that some of them were associated with ministers and churches of other denominations in the promotion of the object, and indeed that they were prominent in the attempt to promote the "union" of different churches for this purpose. Instead, however, of this admission, or of any intimation that there is the slightest defect in the Liturgy on this point, the Editors of the Recorder are pleased to indulge in the following strain of remark :—

"Really our patience begins to fail. By whom were Sabbath schools devised? Who was this 'Robert Raikes,' upon whose 'efforts God has set the undoubted seal of his blessing?' Who have been always prominent in this city as elsewhere, for this very care and instruction of children, which Mr. Barnes denies? We are ready to leave these questions to the Sunday School Union,—to the children, —we had almost said to Presbyterians themselves. Episcopalians have taken the lead in the whole in every case; and nothing is more remarkable among us, than the affection which our children instinctively acquire for this very Liturgy. But we have said enough upon all these points. To go farther into an examination of such statements in this work, though we have omitted not a few, is unnecessary."

Now, I am not in the least degree disposed to call in question the substantial truth of these re-

marks. It was by no means my intention to question the zeal of Episcopalians in this matter, or to disparage 'Robert Raikes.' But how does this prove that my declaration was unfounded, or that there was any propriety in the Editors' allowing their "patience to begin to fail?" How does it demonstrate that there *are* in the ***Liturgy*** any special arrangements for the promotion of religion among the young? How does it show that any such institution was contemplated by the Prayer Book as sabbath schools? How does it make it clear that according to that book, it is proper for Episcopalians to *unite* with other denominations in endeavoring to promote Sunday schools? I said nothing implying that such efforts were not made, or were in themselves improper. I have been disposed to rejoice in all such evidences of a disposition to unite with others in the promotion of any good object. I am very well aware that the Sunday School Union of this city owes much to the zealous co-operation of Episcopalians. But I am also aware, that there is a very large party in the Episcopal church who doubt the propriety of all such attempts at union with others, and who steadfastly maintain that it is not in accordance with the Liturgy, and is a departure from the real spirit of the Episcopal church. They find nothing of all this in the Prayer Book; they regard their own church as called on to conduct all these enterprises without connection with others, and they steadfastly stand aloof from all attempts to induce them to act in union with other denominations. The question is, whether their interpretation of their own book is correct, and on this point the remarks of the Recorder about what 'Robert Raikes' did, and what Episcopalians in this city

have *in fact* done, cast no light whatever. They contribute nothing to show that they are acting in accordance with the rules and arrangements in their own book, or that their high church brethren are wrong in the stand which they have taken in this matter. For one, I still believe that the views of the high church party in reference to all such union with other denominations are wholly *right* so far as the Prayer Book is concerned, and wholly *wrong* so far as the New Testament is concerned; and that in reference to the Sunday school effort, both high church and low are engaged in what the Liturgy does not contemplate. The simple matter of fact is, that the Sunday school is an institution which has grown up since the Liturgy was framed, and even since it was revised to adapt it to the American churches, and it is one of the faults of the system that it does not readily adapt itself to the progress of events. The "petrified wisdom of the age of Elizabeth," is not *all* that is needed in the Christian church of the nineteenth century.

I have now passed over all the points to which I referred in order to show that there are no arrangements or provisions in the Liturgy for promoting the peculiar and distinctive efforts of the low church party except two—prayer meetings, and union on religious subjects with other denominations. Under another head, I have said all that I wish in respect to the former, and in the close I shall have an opportunity of referring to the latter. I dismiss, therefore, this part of the argument.

Points established by the discussion.

I shall now notice in conclusion, some points which have been established by the discussion, and

which it is of importance the churches should understand in reference to the present aspect of Episcopacy.

The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.

1. It is now settled, so far as the authority of the Editors of the Recorder goes, that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is "in some sense the doctrine of the church, and of every minister in the church." In *what* sense, exactly, this is held, the Editors have not, indeed, informed us, but that it is held in *any* sense will probably surprise and grieve those of other denominations who have sympathised with the Evangelical party. I have shown in what senses only it *can* be held, and that it is held in *any* one of these senses is a most alarming fact in reference to the state of religion in the Episcopal church. I have also shown in what sense it is to be held according to the fair interpretation of the Prayer Book, and, until this is disavowed, it is fair to regard the entire Episcopal church as exerting its influence to keep this doctrine before the community, and to commend it to universal belief.

The Evangelical party is anti-Calvinistic.

2. A second point which is settled by the discussion is, that according to the Recorder, the low church party is anti-Calvinistic. On this point, the language of the Editors is without ambiguity. In my Tract, intending no reproach, but meaning it as an expression of sincere respect and kindness, I used the following language: "The low churchman is in general a Calvinist, and frequently of the highest order. He preaches the humbling doctrines of the cross, and advocates the lofty themes of

divine sovereignty in the salvation of men." p. 9. I thought I had good reasons for using this language, and never supposed for one moment that it would be regarded as injurious, or that its truth would be called in question. Scarcely any language which I used, however, appears to have wounded the Editors of the Recorder more, and they reply to it in the following decisive manner:

"Of this assertion, we have simply to say, that WE ARE UNACQUAINTED WITH A SINGLE CLERGYMAN OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH WHO IS A CALVINIST; or who does not reject some of the very peculiar doctrines of Calvinism, such as the limited character of the atonement, and the reprobation of the ungodly, with abhorrence, as in no sense, the teachings of the word of God. These doctrines we leave to Presbyterian maintenance as, we believe, they originated in Presbyterian invention."

Probably no remark made by the Editors of the Recorder in their review, has produced more surprise in the community than this; and if they are to be regarded, as I know not why they should not be, as proper witnesses of the prevalent belief of the Evangelical party, the declaration has revealed a state of things in the Episcopal church that was not even suspected. The Editors have uncommon advantages for testifying on this point. They are identified with that party, and are regarded as among its leaders. They conduct a paper which is known as the organ of the party. They may be presumed to be intimately acquainted with the views of their brethren. Almost two months, moreover, have now passed away since the declaration was made, and so far as appears, it has been received with silent acquiescence by all their brethren as

expressing their views. If their brethren had dissented from it, it would be fair to presume that they would not suffer a statement of so serious a character respecting their doctrinal belief to have passed unnoticed.

It is not my intention to go into a defence of Calvinism, or to show that once it was not deemed dishonorable in the Episcopal church to hold the system of doctrines known by that name. The declaration before us as a statement of a fact, its exact meaning, and its importance in understanding the "position of the Evangelical party," are all that the purpose of my argument requires me to notice. I might show that the doctrine of limited atonement is no part of Calvinism, as the Editors suppose, for Calvin taught that Christ died for the whole human race—*totum humanum genus;* and might show that the doctrine of limited atonement has not been held by the great body of those who have held that system of faith. I might show, with great ease, that the Calvinistic doctrines were not "*originated in* PRESBYTERIAN INVENTION;" a declaration which evinces singular want of deliberation in him who penned it. But these are not the points before us. They are, what is the fair interpretation to be put on this language of the Recorder? What does it disclose as to the 'position' of the party with which they are identified? Perhaps it might be said that they mean only to disclaim the belief of these two points which they have specified, the doctrine of 'limited atonement,' and the 'reprobation of the ungodly;' and that they meant to extend their denial no further. But then, it would have been very easy to have said so, while the general belief in the system would have been conceded. But the fair interpre-

tation of their language does not admit of this construction. There is a warmth, an ardor, an earnestness about the language applied to Calvinism as a whole, which shows that there was no desire to be identified with it in any way whatever. It is such language of revulsion and abhorrence as a passionate Athanasian might be supposed to use of Arianism; or as a heated follower of Augustine would use of the views of Pelagius. There is the express declaration, "We are unacquainted with a single clergyman of the Episcopal church who is a Calvinist." There is the language of strong "*abhorrence*," used of one of the doctrines commonly regarded as peculiar to the system. "We are unacquainted with a single clergyman who does not reject the doctrine of the reprobation of the ungodly *with abhorrence*." There is the strong and positive assertion that these doctrines "originated in *Presbyterian invention;*" and that the Editors are disposed to "leave them to *Presbyterian* maintenance," as if an *Episcopalian* could have nothing to do with them.

From these expressions, it is fair to infer that the Editors do not wish to be understood as holding to the Calvinistic system, and that as far as their knowledge extends, the Evangelical party, in common with high churchmen, are unanimous in the rejection of the system.

It is by no means my intention to go into a defence of Calvinism, or to attempt to prove that Calvinism is taught in the articles of the Episcopal church. The whole object of my enquiry is accomplished if the "*position*," actually occupied by the low church party is ascertained. If I had charged on that party a denial of the doctrines of Calvin-

ism, I should have supposed that I was doing them manifest injustice, for I supposed that quite generally they regarded the Calvinistic doctrine as being that of the articles of their church. There are two or three remarks which it seems proper however, to make here as illustrative of this feature in the "position" of the Evangelical party.

(1.) One is, that this horror of Calvanism has not always been felt by the Fathers or friends of the Episcopal church. It was not so regarded in the time of king Edward, whose Catechism which was subscribed by Ridley and Cranmer, contains the following sentiment:—

"*As many as are in this faith steadfast, were fore chosen, predestinated and appointed to everlasting life, before the world was made.* Witness hereof, they have within in their hearts the Spirit of Christ, the author, earnest, and unfailable pledge of this faith; which faith only is able to perceive the mysteries of God; only brings peace unto the heart, only taketh hold on the righteousness which is in Christ Jesus. . . . . . The first, principal, and most proper cause of our justification and salvation, is the goodness and love of God, whereby *he choose us for his before he made the world.* . . . Finally, to say all in sum; whatever is in us or may be done of us, honest, pure, true, and good; it altogether springeth out of this most pleasant rock, from this most plentiful fountain, *the goodness, love, choice, and unchangeable purpose of God.* He is the cause; the rest are the fruits and effects. . . . . . The Holy Ghost is called holy, not only for his own holiness, but because the *elect of God* are made holy by him. The *Church is the company*

of those who are called to eternal life by the Holy Ghost, by whom she is guided, governed, &c."

This horror of Calvinism was not felt in the days of Toplady, of Bradford, of Latimer, of Hooper, of Philpot, and of Jewell, among the holiest men that the church has ever produced, all of whom were Calvinists, and most of whom, under the influence and sustaining power of the Calvinistic faith, sealed their faith with their blood.* This horror was not felt by Horsley, nor was it felt in the days of John Newton, of Cowper, of Thomas Scott; nor *is* it felt by the conductors of the Christian Observer in England, or by many of the most excellent and eminent living ministers in that church.

(2.) This horror of Calvinism is not easily reconcilable with a belief in the articles of the Episcopal church. The Calvinistic character of those articles, at least to all those who are *out* of the Episcopal church, is apparent, and there can be to none but an Episcopalian any considerable doubt as to their Calvinistic origin and meaning The well known 17th article is in the following words :—

Art. XVII. "Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation, those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ, to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor," &c. &c. Its conclusion is, "Furthermore we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scrip-

* See the proof that they were Calvinists in the quotations from their writings in the Presbyterian for April, 13, 1844.

ture: And in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God."

It is often said by Episcopalians that the qualifying clause at the end of this article, is decisive proof of a design to contradict and exclude the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination. Now this clause is nearly copied from Calvin's Institutes, and the latter part of it is a literal transalation of this Reformer's caution, against the abuse of this very doctrine. Let the two be placed in parellel columns.

Article xvii.	Calvin's Institutes.
"Furthermore we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture."	"Quando suis *promissionibus* (Deus) vult nos esse contentos, neque *alibi* quaerere an futurus sit nobis exorabilis." Lib. iii. Cap. xxiv. § 5.

The remainder is a literal translation. It is as follows:—

"And in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God."	"*Proinde in rebus agendis ea est nobis perspicienda Dei voluntas, quam verbo suo declarat*," Lib. i. Cap. xvii. § 5.

Even the Armenian Bishop Burnet was obliged to confess, in regard to this article, that "It is very *probable* that those who penned this article *meant* that the decree was *absolute*." And again he says:—

"But *the Calvinists* have less occasion for scruple, since the article does seem more plainly to favor them;" and again, "It is not to be denied but that the article seems to be framed according to St. Augustin's doctrine;" and again, "In England the first Reformers were generally in the sublapsarian hypothesis," &c. &c. &c.

I have said that the Calvinistic character of the Episcopal articles to those *out* of "the church," is apparent. On this point, there are two facts which are of some importance in arriving at the meaning of these articles. The first is, that the XVIIth Article, in its plain sense, has always been entirely satisfactory to all Calvinists. They have never had but one understanding of its meaning, and with all the tenacity and scrupulosity with which they hold the Calvinistic views, they would regard the XVIIth Article as a fair expression of their opinions. It is undoubtedly true that there never has been a Calvinist *out* of the Episcopal church, learned or unlearned, who has had any other opinion of that article than that it is Calvinistic. The other fact is, that the Methodist denomination, who are avowedly Armenians, have been so thoroughly satisfied of the Calvinism of this article, that they have wholly omitted it in their own articles; judging it to be honest that, as they did not hold to the doctrine, they should not retain it in their formularies of faith. Of all the Methodists who have lived, and who still live, in this land or in England, from Wesley and Coke down to the very obscurest local preacher, it is probable that there has never been one who has not fully believed that that article is Calvinistic, and who would not have rejected it from their articles of faith with more than the "abhorrence" with which the Editors of the Recorder spoke of Calvinism.

(3.) There is reason to believe still, that notwithstanding the disclaimer of the Editors of the Recorder, there *are* those in the Evangelical party who are Calvinists; though it may be true, as a party, that they are less favourably inclined to that

faith than the religious community have commonly supposed. It would not be difficult to collect from the Recorder itself, in years that are past, sentiments that are of a highly Calvinistic tendency, and commendations of books that are of the most thorough-going Calvinistic character. It would be easy to collect from living men expressions of sentiments that strongly favor Calvinism. Even since the Review in the Recorder appeared, the following extract from the writings of one of the Bishops of the Episcopal church has been published by an Episcopalian who shows that he is no stranger to what is held in his own church.

"Did our Reformers," writes the catholic-minded Bishop Meade, (himself a Calvinist,) "protest against Calvinism, or Armenianism?—or against too *high* or too *low* views of church polity? Was it on any of these accounts that our church was denominated Protestant? In opposition to this it should be remembered that those who are engaged in drawing up, and from time to time reviewing and sitting in judgment upon our Articles and services, were *without distinction Calvinists* and Armenians, high and low churchmen."—The Novelties which disturb our Unity. p. 51. Are the Editors of the Recorder entire strangers to "the catholic-minded Bishop Meade?" How, then, are we to understand their remarkable declaration about Calvinism? The churches of other denominations will probably wait with some interest to obtain farther light on this point. *Is* it the purpose of the low church party to reject and renounce Calvinism "with abhorrence?" Do they wish to be identified with Armenians wholly, and to be understood to be Armenians? If so, this is a developement of Episcopacy which was not an-

ticipated, and which will give a new view to this whole question. The well known remark of Lord Chatham, when speaking of the established church in England, it is probable, will never be forgotten: "We have a Popish Liturgy, Calvinistic articles, and an Armenian clergy." Of the truth of the two former of these assertions, the community at large, out of the Episcopal church, has little doubt. It was to have been hoped that the whole tendency of the efforts of the Evangelical party in the church would have been to disprove the latter assertion so far as their influence could go. The tendency of the testimony of the Recorder is to prove that *all* his Lordship's sweeping declaration is well founded.

No other church is to be recognised by the Evangelical party.

3. A third point settled by this discussion, it would seem, is, that no other churches are to be recognised by the low church party than those under Episcopal government. In my Tract, in view of certain things which seemed to me to be irreconcilable in the treatment of other denominations by low church Episcopalians, I submitted the following questions:

'Do the Evangelical party regard the ministers of other denominations as in any sense authorised ministers of the gospel, and their churches as true churches? If they *do*—(which we do not believe to be the case)—then we ask of them, why they are never in any proper way so recognised? Why do they not come out and openly say so? Why do they never admit them to their pulpits? Why do they never protest against their being re-ordained when one of their number leaves the church of his

fathers, and enters the service of the Episcopal denomination? Why do they submit to the gross public indignity offered to the Protestant churches by the uniform acts of the Episcopal church, admitting a Catholic priest at once to officiate at her altars without re-ordination; demanding that every other minister shall be ordained?'

The object of these questions was, if any of that party thought them of sufficient importance to be answered, to obtain an explicit statement on a point of great moment to the Christian community at large. It was to learn exactly where the low church party stood on this subject, and whether they wish to be regarded as identified with their high church brethren in their exclusive views respecting other churches. It was to be presumed that there would be entire frankness on this point, and it was supposed that the churches had a right to be informed on this point. It was not, indeed, supposed that the opinions of low church Episcopalians would do any thing in determining the question whether the churches of other denominations are, in fact, true churches; but intermingled as we are and with the efforts which Episcopalians are constantly making to increase their numbers, it was considered as desirable to understand in what light they regarded others — whether as true churches, or as left to the "uncovenanted mercies of God." It is from no invidious intention that there is a wish in the community to be informed on this point, but it *is* of importance to understand it as among the developements of Episcopacy, and as illustrating its real tendency. The Editors of the Recorder could not, indeed, be regarded as *bound* to answer these questions, but they have felt them-

selves called upon to notice the inquiry in their own way, and I purpose now to submit a few remarks on their answer.

(1.) It would have been perfectly easy, if the questions were noticed at all, to have given an explicit answer; an answer without hesitation, and without ambiguity. This, too, it was not unreasonable to expect; but this has not been done. There is no distinct and open statement, whether they do, or do not recognise other churches as true churches. In Bishop Hobart's writings, in Bishop Hopkins's recent letters, in the "Banner of the Cross," and in the "Churchman," we have statements of which no one can complain for any want of explicitness. Such a direct answer will not be found, *as yet*, in the Episcopal Recorder.

(2.) In the answer itself, it is not difficult to determine the true opinion of the Low church party, as expounded by the Editors. Their *real* opinions may be gathered from the following particulars in their review. (*a*) "Certainly the recognition of another church than the Episcopal, or of other ministers of the gospel than the Episcopal, is a thing unknown to the Prayer Book." The Editors give indeed as a *reason* for this, that no other churches were known at the time when the Prayer Book was composed, and this remark is made in that connection. It, however, admits the main fact that *in the Prayer Book* no other church is recognised but the Episcopal. The *reason* assigned, I shall have occasion to examine in another place. (*b*) The remarks of the Editors seem to imply that it would not be proper or right to have had a prayer inserted in the Prayer Book for other churches. The tendency of such prayers would be only to "*justify*

schism"—a thing of which an Episcopalian seems to have more horror than of anything else. Thus they say :—

"*Whether it would be right to justify such schisms by praying for them*, is a question which we may well leave the Presbyterian church to answer. Do the Old School ministers pray habitually for the success of the men of the New School, who have divided from them? Does Mr. Barnes pray for the success of those who have gone out from him? Or do they both only, as the Liturgy does, pray that God would 'bring into the way of truth, all such as have erred and are deceived?'"

As to the *questions* asked here, they can be answered in a word. "Old School ministers," and "New School ministers," never have any hesitancy in praying for each other. I have heard, by far, more prayers offered for the "Old School" party in the Presbyterian church by "New School" ministers, than I have for any or all other denominations by name; and I *know* that there is no hesitancy about offering such prayers, and that those who offer them never pause to ponder the miserable interrogatory, whether this would be "to justify schism." But it may be fairly *inferred* from this assertion of the Editors of the Recorder, that they would not deem it "right" to pray for any other churches or denominations of christians than their own; and if so, it is not unfair to infer that they do not regard them as true churches. They can have no hesitation in supposing that it *is* "right" that a prayer for the *true* church should be found in the Prayer Book, and should be habitually used. (*c*) The same thing is apparent from the quotation from the Liturgy with which their remarks about

other churches are closed, when they say that the "Liturgy" "prays" that God would "bring into the way of truth all such *as have erred and are deceived*." That is, it is "right" to pray for other churches only under one of the categories of "having *erred*," or being "*deceived*." To which of these categories, or whether to both, they are to be surrendered, the Editors have not informed us, and it is not material. Either will sufficiently indicate the light in which they are to be regarded, and show that, in their apprehension, to pray for them otherwise than as "erring" or as "being deceived," would be to "justify schism." As those who "have erred" or are "deceived," moreover will include all "Turks, heretics, and infidels," it would seem that the Liturgy contemplates all, so far at least as prayer for them is concerned, as lying on the same level. Now this is *not* the way in which other denominations besides Episcopalians pray. They pray for all who love the Lord Jesus; for all churches; for all ministers of the gospel; nor is it a common thing, so far as I have the means of knowing, to make any distinction between those of their own and other denominations. I may add,

(3.) That the views here expressed by the Recorder about prayer for other churches accord in the main, with all the open acts of the low, as well as the high church party. They never recognise other churches as such. If they recognise their baptism it is, as we have seen, only as lay baptism. They submit, without a note of remonstrance to the public indignity shown to all other denominations, *except the Roman Catholics*, when the ministers of other churches are required to be re-ordained on being admitted to "orders" in the Episcopal church.

The Bishops of that party, so far as appears, are as prompt to re-ordain as any Puseyite Bishop in the land, and would no more admit a Presbyterian, a Baptist, a Methodist, a German Lutheran, or a Dutch Reformed minister to orders without this ceremony than would a Bishop with the highest views of the Tractarians. It is, therefore, entirely consistent for the Editors of the Episcopal Recorder to say, that "the recognition of another church than the Episcopal, or of other ministers of the Gospel than the Episcopal, is a thing unknown to the Prayer Book."

For this, however, the Editors assign a reason, which it is of some importance to advert to for a moment. This is not done, say they, because "when the Prayer Book was formed, there were no others [no other churches] in existence; and it would have required something indeed, beyond 'the petrified wisdom of the age of Elizabeth,' p. 56, to have conceived in advance, the multiplied and multiformed sects, into which the then nascent Presbyterianism was to rend and divide the professed body of Christ; because the blessed martyrs and divines who compiled it, were not gifted with prophecy; and it stands forth to witness from generation to generation, of a time and state, when the church was *one* in constitution, and to show thus incidentally, but unanswerably, that all the schisms which now distract and deform the aspect of Christianity, are of mere modern growth, 'but of yesterday.'"

Now even if this were so, it would not be easy to understand why, when the Liturgy was revised after the American Revolution, some recognition of other churches was not introduced into the book, though the "blessed martyrs who compiled it were

not gifted with prophecy ;" and could not forsee that there ever would be any other sect in the Christian church except the Episcopalian. But the Editors undertake to account for the fact that no such prayers were inserted by "these blessed martyrs and divines" because "when the Prayer Book was formed there were no other churches in existence," and the Prayer Book "stands forth to witness, from generation to generation, of a time and state when the church was *one* in constitution." The first act in England, after the Reformation, respecting the Prayer Book was in 1537, when there was composed and published "The godly and pious institution of a Christian man ; containing a declaration of the Lord's prayer, the AVE MARIA, the creed, the ten commandments, *the Seven Sacraments*," &c. This was republished in 1540, and 1543, with corrections and alterations, and "set forth by the king, with the advice of his clergy." In 1540, Henry VIII. appointed a committee of Bishops and divines, to "reform the rituals and offices of the church," and to the other things introduced in 1537, there were added the Venite, Te Deum, and some hymns and collects in English.—This whole work was revised in the time of Edward VI. in 1547, and the Liturgy was drawn up substantially as we have it, with the "public offices for Sundays and Holidays, for Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony, burial of the dead, and other special occasions." At the head of the committee which engaged in this revision, was Archbishop Cranmer, and it was of this book that the Parliament of 1548 ordained that it had been set forth *by the aid of the Holy Ghost.*

The book was again revised and amended with

the aid of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr, of Germany, and of Alesse, a Scotch divine, and thus revised and amended, was confirmed by the Parliament of 1551. In the reign of Elizabeth it underwent another revision by a committee, of which Matthew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, was the chairman, and was adopted and approved by Elizabeth. In the time of James I., it underwent another revision, and again in the time of Charles II. in 1661, another still. See Wheatley on the Book of Common Prayer, pp. 24—32. The same book was again revised in this country, in 1792, and "established" in the form in which we now have it. In view of these facts, it is natural to ask what is the precise thing which was meant by the Editors of the Episcopal Recorder, when they say with such confidence, that "the church was then *one* in constitution," and that "when the Prayer Book was formed there were no others in existence." Of the facts referred to respecting their own much-lauded Liturgy, it cannot be reasonably supposed they are ignorant. But were there then no other Protestant churches on the face of the earth than the one in England? Did the Reformation begin in England? Was there neither in the time of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Elizabeth, James, or Charles II., no other church "in existence" but the Episcopal church in England? Martin Bucer, and Peter Martyr, and Alesse—certainly not exactly Episcopalians—assisted in one revision of the Prayer Book, and where during all this time were the churches of Germany, of Switzerland, of France, and of Scotland? In 1792, were there no other churches in the United States in behalf of whom a prayer *might* have been inserted in the Prayer Book,

besides that *one* that "God would bring into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived?" The assertion that there were no other churches at that time, bears at least the marks of singular haste, and it is difficult to account for the fact that a learned *Episcopalian* should have ventured such a remark in any circumstances whatever. Probably most persons acquainted with the history of the Reformation, will not consider it quite satisfactory to account for the entire want of all reference to other churches in the Prayer Book, to say "that when the Prayer Book was formed there were no others in existence; and it would have required something, indeed, beyond the 'petrified wisdom of the age of Elizabeth' to have conceived, *in advance*, the multiplied and multiformed sects into which the then nascent Presbyterianism was to rend and divide the professed body of Christ."

No other ministers are to be recognised but Episcopal.

4. A fourth thing which seems to be settled by the review in the Recorder is, that no other ministers are to be recognised but those which are Episcopally ordained. Whether any such ministers were to be recognised, was one of the questions proposed in the Tract to which the Editors of the Recorder have undertaken to reply. The question was, (p. 63,) whether "the Evangelical party regard the ministers of other denominations as in any sense authorised ministers of the gospel?" A categorical answer to this would have been one of the easiest things imaginable, and if they were regarded as such, it is to be presumed that the Editors would have found pleasure in saying so. It would

have been so in accordance with charity and justice, and would have so tended to promote good feeling in the churches, to say nothing of its influence in commending Episcopacy to the favor of the community, that every consideration would have prompted to a distinct and definite admission that others were to be regarded as true ministers of the gospel. In the absence, however, of any such distinct recognition, we are to ascertain the opinions of the Editors from the incidental hints which they have thought proper to submit to the public.

Perhaps the very absence itself of any such recognition, in the circumstances, will be regarded by most persons as sufficient proof that they do not design any such recognition. But they have used expressions which cannot be reconciled with any such recognition, and which cannot be mistaken as "defining the position" which they wish to be understood as occupying. In order to give the Editors all the benefit which can be derived from their reply to the question proposed, I will insert their answer at length.

"There must be some line and limit of admission into the pulpit, and our church, to discuss no relative questions of comparative schism, has wisely made it around the simple body of her own ministers. Presbyterians have a line equally exclusive and arbitrary. Why do they not invite the preachers of the Society of Friends to officiate for them? Why do they thus *unchurch* a christian denomination as respectable in personal character as themselves? What Presbyterian pulpits were opened to Joseph John Gurney, in his ministry in this country, acknowledged by all to be one of the best and greatest of living christian teachers and writers?

How empty seems the complaint that the Episcopal church denies the claims of other bodies to the character and title of churches, from those who can write and publish such books as 'Quakerism not Christianity,' by one of Mr. Barnes' particular and eminent friends? When or where have we affirmed that Presbyterianism was not christianity? How absurd comes such a complaint again from a man who deliberately excludes our whole body from the pale of christianity, and can say, p. 68, 'There has been a feeling, the correctness of which no one seemed to regard it as proper to doubt, that the Episcopal sect was to be numbered in the family of Evangelical churches.' Is this the man to complain that we do not acknowledge his ministry, or invite his labors among our churches? He affirms of us, what we have never ventured to affirm of his body; with how much injustice,—nay, conscious injustice, we shall not trust ourselves to say. And then he asks, why he is not invited into our pulpits, to preach his doctrines to our own people. But if we should invite Mr. Barnes, how could he conscientiously agree to read a liturgy, the entire hostility of which to all Evangelical truth and teaching, he has here so repeatedly and plainly proclaimed? How could he submit to our Popish vestments, and postures, and forms? Or how could he ask the omission of a Liturgy, which he says, we 'are compelled to use?' We do not feel in any degree called upon to consider the abstract question of the validity or regularity of Mr. Barnes' ministry in this connection. There are sufficient reasons to be given for not inviting him 'to preach and administer the sacraments' to our people, without entering upon this. The readers of the Recorder need no

information of the stand which we have uniformly taken upon this question."

In noticing this answer of the Recorder to the distinct question proposed to the Evangelical party, whether 'they regard the ministers of other denominations as in any sense authorised ministers of the gospel,' I would observe, that the question is not, why "Presbyterians do not invite the preachers of the Society of Friends to officiate for them," or whether the "Presbyterian pulpits were opened to Joseph John Gurney in his ministry in this country," or whether the book called "Quakerism not Christianity," be or be not well written, or whether "Mr. Barnes could conscientiously use the Liturgy," or "submit to Popish vestments, postures, and forms," but whether the Evangelical party *do or do not regard the ministers of other denominations as in any sense authorised ministers of the gospel?* I should have no hesitation whatever, in expressing an opinion on all the collateral subjects thus noticed by the Recorder; but it is difficult to see how an answer to these questions would throw any light on the enquiry how the Evangelical party regard the ministers of other denominations? It is also somewhat difficult to know the precise reason why the attention of the readers of the Recorder is turned from the simple question proposed, to these collateral and quite irrelevant subjects. They are, doubtless of importance in their place, but they contribute little to the elucidation of the only enquiry which was made on this subject. Is it the proper interpretation of this method of meeting the question, that the Editors were from some cause reluctant to answer the enquiry proposed?

Yet it is not difficult to ascertain what the

answer would have been, if one had been explicitly given. For (1.) It is *assumed* that Presbyterians have a line which is "exclusive and arbitrary;" (2.) It is implied that it is proper that Episcopalians should "have a line" equally "exclusive and arbitrary" as it is *supposed* Presbyterians have; that is, one that is *as* "exclusive" of the ministers of *all* other denominations as it is supposed the rule of Presbyterians is of Friends; and (3.) this "exclusive" position of the Evangelical Party is stated in terms which cannot be misunderstood. Thus the Editors say, "There must be some line and limit of admission into the pulpit, and our church, to discuss no relative questions of comparative schism" [*schism* being in the view of all genuine Episcopalians the sin of greatest magnitude.] "*has wisely made it around the simple body of her own ministry.*" That is, the ministers of no other denomination whatever are to be admitted into an Episcopal pulpit. The "line and limit" of admission into the pulpit is "made around" the Episcopal "body" of ministers only, and includes no others. But the "pulpit" is the appropriate place where ministers of the Gospel are to be recognised. They may be met in a Board of Trustees in a University or Academy, but there men meet together only as Trustees; they may be met as managers of a Tract or Bible Society, but they meet there only as managers and not as ministers of the Gospel; they may be met on a platform advocating the cause of temperance, but there they meet only as the friends of temperance. In these places they are no more recognised *as* ministers than brokers are recognised there as brokers, or lawyers as lawyers, or physicians as physicians. They meet as the guardians of char-

tered interests ; as friends of science ; as patrons of literature; as advocates of the Bible or of temperance. To know who are recognised as brokers, we must look to the Board of brokers, and ask what is " the line and limit of admisssion" into their order; to know who are recognised as lawyers, we must ask what is " the line and limit of admission" prescribed by the courts ; to know who are recognised as physicians, we must ask what is " the line and limit of admission" prescribed by the medical societies. There " must be some line and limit of admission" into each of these professions and callings, and each one " has wisely made it around the simple body of" its own members. On the same principle, it is presumed, the Evangelical party in common with their high church brethren, however courteous they may be in other places ; however they may regard the ministers of other denominations as good and well-meaning gentlemen, and however ready they may be to co-operate with them in the spread of the Bible, and in the promotion of temperance, science, literature, or liberty, yet " wisely makes the line and limit in regard to the ministry around the simple body" of the Episcopal clergy.

This interpretation accords with all those facts in the case to which I have already adverted. They never invite the ministers of other denominations into their pulpits ; they never speak of them as " clergymen ;" they never ask them to participate in administering the communion ; so far as any public testimony goes, they regard their baptism only as lay baptism ; they quietly acquiesce when Papal priests are admitted to the ministry in the Episcopal church without being re-ordained, while all Protestants, except Moravians, are excluded;

and they never lift a note of remonstrance when the public indignity is shown to all other Protestant churches by demanding that their ministers, if they become Episcopalians, no matter how aged, venerable, learned, or holy they may be, shall be received according to the "*form and manner of making* DEACONS" before they shall be allowed to exercise their ministry in the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States. And this is in entire accordance with the directions in the Prayer Book, which has drawn the "line and limit" of admission into the pulpit around the 'simple body' of the Episcopal ministry, as closely as any churchman could desire. "No man," says the Prayer Book, "shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, in this church, or suffered to execute the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto according to the form hereafter following, *or hath had Episcopal consecration or ordination*."—Preface to the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. How a low churchman *could* regard the ministers of any other denomination as authorised ministers of the gospel, it is impossible to conceive. The Prayer Book never designed to recognise any other ministry than that which has been Episcopally ordained. These considerations lead to the inevitable conclusion that the Evangelical party, if the Editors of the Recorder are fair expounders of their views, mean to be understood as recognising none as ministers who have not been prelatically ordained.

These views, on an important subject now agitating the Christian churches, and destined to agitate them still more, are now submitted to the

public. The *motives* with which I have written, are my own, and of them but one Being has a right to judge. Whether the *argument* has been conducted with a proper temper; whether I have used such words as became a Christian; and whether the considerations which I have suggested have the weight which they seem to me to have, are points which the public are well qualified to decide. "I have spoken freely, but not in anger." I have meant to "extenuate nothing," nor have I

"set down aught in malice."

THE END.

DATE DUE

JUN 15 1994

JUN 15 1996

HIGHSMITH # 45220

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01030 0756